

MAY 26 30 B

INDEXED

Vol. XXI.

APRIL-JUNE, 1930

No. 2

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

FOUNDED BY
PROFESSOR HENRY ALFRED TODD

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO RESEARCH IN THE ROMANCE
LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

Edited by
JOHN L. GERIG

RDTA



PUBLISHED BY
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
PRINCE AND LEMON STS., LANCASTER, PA., and
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879

YOUNG'S FRENCH GRAMMAR:

G
I
N
N

MODERN
FOREIGN
LANGUAGE
BOOKS

AN AID TO READING

The essentials of grammar contributing immediately to the ability to read. The point of view based on the declaration of the Modern Foreign Language Study that preparation for early reading should be the first objective of modern foreign language work. Classroom use has proved that pupils who master Young's French Grammar are well equipped for reading. Circular No. 56 will give you further details. *Young's French Grammar is one of the 235 titles in Ginn and Company's Modern Foreign Language Series.*

GINN AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago Atlanta Dallas Columbus San Francisco

HISTOIRES GAIES

Edited by Professor H. STANLEY SCHWARZ
New York University

TO know the French, one must know French humor—that elusive unconquerable French *gaieté* so deep-rooted in the Gallic soul. *Histoires gaies* presents a cross-section of this dominant national characteristic through the diverting stories of such typical writers as Jules Renard, Henri Lavedan, Max and Alex Fischer, Pierre Mille, Roger Régis, Pierre Chaine, and others.

The *Exercises* call for real mental effort on the part of the student. Locutions selected from the text form the basis of drill in idiomatic expressions. Subjects for compositions are suggested for the convenience of the instructor.

An altogether worth-while book for intermediate work.

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago Atlanta San Francisco Dallas London

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

FOUNDED BY
PROFESSOR HENRY ALFRED TODD

Edited by
JOHN L. GERIG

PATRONS

MRS. HENRY ALFRED TODD
MRS. FREDERIC S. LEE
MRS. HELEN HARTLEY JENKINS
MRS. JOHN L. GERIG
MISS BARBARA MATULKA

MR. ANTHONY CAMPAGNA
MR. HENRI F. MULLER
MR. OTTO H. KAHN
MR. THOMAS W. LAMONT
MR. LYNN THORNDIKE

MR. G. L. VAN ROOSBROECK

CONTENTS

Illustrations: Facsimile Pages from M. B. Anderson's *The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri*.

Essais de Sociologie linguistique.....LEO JORDAN 99
Francesca Da Rimini and the *Dolce Stil Nuovo*.....D. VITTORINI 116
Unpublished French Letters of the Eighteenth Century.....R. L. HAWKINS 128

MISCELLANEOUS

A Brief Examination into the Historical Background of Martínez de la Rosa's *La Conjuración de Venecia*.....R. AVRETT 132
Two Notes on *Les Cenci* of Stendhal.....LUCY M. GAY 137
The Second Person Plural in Portuguese.....E. B. WILLIAMS 142
Spanish *colmena*, Portuguese *colmeia*.....E. H. TUTTLE 145
Propertius, *laudator temporis acti*.....A. STEINER 145

REVIEWS

M. B. Anderson, *The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri*.
O. A. BONTEMPO and J. L. GERIG 148
Some Studies on Rimbaud: M. Coulon, *La Vie de Rimbaud et de son Œuvre*; F. Ruchon, *Jean-Arthur Rimbaud, sa Vie, son Œuvre, son Influence*; A. R. de Renéville, *Rimbaud le Voyant*; A. Rimbaud, *Correspondance Inédite*.....S. A. RHODES 152
D. Mornet, *Histoire de la Clarté française*.....E. E. ROVILLAIN 157
M. Romera-Navarro, *Miguel de Unamuno, novelista—poeta—essayista*.
W. L. FICHTER 160
Miguel de Unamuno, *Mist*.....PASTORIZA FLORES 162
E. Seillière, *Romanticism*.....163
Jules Laforgue, *Six Moral Tales*, translated by Frances Newman.....166
Jacques de Lacretelle, *Histoire de Paola Ferrani*. G. L. VAN ROOSBROECK 169
Italian Book Notes.....O. A. BONTEMPO 170
French Book Notes.
G. L. VAN ROOSBROECK, E. H. POLINGER, D. K. ROTHSTEIN 171
Rumanian Book Notes.....J. L. FERARU 175
Romance Language Class-Texts.....BARBARA MATULKA and S. ROGERS 177
Instituto de las Españas.....R. A. BECERRA 180
In Memoriam: Adolphe Cohn.....J. L. G. 182
Varia.....J. L. G. 183

ALEXANDRE DUMAS *fil*s DRAMATIST

By H. STANLEY SCHWARZ, Ph.D., Associate Professor of
French in New York University. Price: \$4.00

THE FUNERAL ELEGY AND THE RISE OF ENGLISH ROMANTICISM.

By JOHN W. DRAPER, Ph.D., Professor of English in West Virginia University.
Price: \$6.50

WILLIAM MASON: A STUDY IN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY CULTURE.

By JOHN W. DRAPER, Ph.D. Price: \$6.50

CHAUCE'S CONSTANCE AND ACCUSED QUEENS.

By MARGARET SCHLAUCH, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of English in New York
University. Price: \$3.00

CAVALIER AND PURITAN: BALLADS AND BROADSIDES ILLUSTRATING THE PERIOD OF THE GREAT REBELLION, 1640-1660.

By HYDER E. ROLLINS, Ph.D., Professor of English in Harvard University.
Students' edition: \$6.50
De luxe edition: \$7.50

THOMAS SHADWELL: HIS LIFE AND COMEDIES.

By ALBERT S. BORMAN, Ph.D., Professor of English in New York University.
Price: \$5.00

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE ABBÉ BAUTAIN.

By WALTER MARSHALL HORTON, S.T.M., Ph.D., Associate Professor of Sys-
tematic Theology in the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology. Price: \$5.00

EFFICIENT COMPOSITION, A COLLEGE RHETORIC.

By ARTHUR HUNTINGTON NASON, Ph.D., Professor of English in New York
University. Price: \$2.50

JAMES SHIRLEY, DRAMATIST: A BIOGRAPHICAL AND CRITICAL STUDY.

By ARTHUR HUNTINGTON NASON, Ph.D.
(The New York University Press, Selling Agent) Price: \$5.00

THE NEW YORK UNIVERSITY PRESS

Washington Square East

New York City

Barja, César, Libros y Autores Clásicos - - - \$ 2.50

An extensive and unsophisticated study of the great writers and works of the
Spanish classical literature from the "Poema del Cid" to the end of the Seven-
teenth Century.

Barja, César, Libros y Autores Modernos - - - \$ 2.00

This is the continuation of "Libros y Autores Clásicos." The author takes
up his material from where the first volume ends—at the end of the seven-
teenth century—and carries it through the nineteenth century. The same
treatment which characterized the first volume is observed in the present work.

In Preparation: Barja, Libros y Autores Contemporáneos

Pequeño Larousse Ilustrado, 1929 - - - \$ 3.00

Fitzmaurice-Kelly, Historia de la Literatura Española, Madrid 1921, Cloth - - - \$ 2.00

Constans, Chrestomathie de l'ancien français - - \$ 2.00

Meyer-Luebke, Grammaire des Langues Romanes, 4 vols. \$15.00

Nouveau Larousse Illustré, 1930 - - - \$ 2.00

Morillot, Le Roman en France. Depuis 1610 jusqu'à nos jours. Lectures et Esquisses - - - \$ 2.50

E. Velazquez Bringas & R. Heliodoro Valle, Indice de Escritores, Mexico 1928, bound - - - \$ 2.00

Godefroy, Lexique de l'ancien français. Cloth - - \$ 5.00

G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33 E. 10th St., New York

LARGEST STOCK IN NEW YORK OF BOOKS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

- 97 The town where I was born sits on the strand
beside the water where descends the Po
in quest of peace, with his companion band.
- 100 Love that in gentle heart is soon aglow
laid hold on this one for the person fair
bereft me, and the mode is still my woe.
- 103 Love that doth none beloved from loving spare,
to do him pleasure made my heart so fain
that, as thou seest, not yet doth it forbear.
- 106 Love led us down to death together: Cain
awaits the soul of him who laid us dead."
These words from them to us returned again.
- 109 Hearing those injured souls, I bowed my head
and held it for so long dejectedly
that, "Whereon thinkest thou?" the Poet said.
- 112 When I could answer, I began: "Ah me,
how many tender thoughts, what longing drew
these lovers to the pass of agony."
- 115 Thereafter I turned to them, and spoke anew:
"Francesca, all thy torments dim mine eyes
with tears that flow for sympathy and rue.
- 118 But tell me, in the time of the sweet sighs
by what, and how did Love to you disclose
the vague desires, that ye should realize?"
- 121 And she to me: "It is the woe of woes
remembrance of the happy time to keep
in misery,—and that thy Teacher knows.
- 124 But if thy yearning be indeed so deep
to know the first root of a love so dear,
I will do even as they who speak and weep.
- 127 One day together read we for good cheer
of Love, how he laid hold on Launcelot:
alone we were and without any fear.

LINE 97

Reverse, where Dante spent his latter years in the service or under the protection of his lord, Guido Novello da Polenta, a nephew of Francesca. The mode of her death is so grievous to her because it deprived her of a chance to repent.

XXX

The Celestial Rose

LINES 1-9

According to Dante's conception the globe of earth was considerably smaller than it really is, so that when the sun is in the zenith at a point about six thousand miles east of us it will not yet have risen where we are. As the brightest handmaid of the sun, Aurora, approaches our place of observation, the stars rapidly grow dimmer and dimmer until even the brilliant morning star is shut from sight. Meanwhile the vast conical shadow of earth will be sinking as the sun rises until, at a given moment, sun and shadow will balance each other on the plane of the horizon, just as in the picture at the beginning of the preceding Canto the rising full moon is balanced against the setting sun. So as Dante soars with Beatrice into the empyrean the angelic circles are quenched in that excess of light. Such is the comparison, at once precise and sublime, which stands as a pylon or stately gateway before this noble concluding series of Cantos.

LINE 27

The memory suffers, as Torrance puts it, "a solution of continuity." Cf. xiv, 81; xxiii, 61-63. This may have suggested to Lowell his sad witicism, "My memory has

- 1 When, eastward ho! six thousand miles perchance
noon blazes, and toward the level bed
the shadow of this world already slants,
- 4 The deep of central heaven above our head
grows so suffused that here a star and yon
begins to pale the radiance it shed,
- 7 And, as the brightest handmaid of the sun
advances, so are quencht the heavenly graces
star after star, even to the fairest one.
- 10 Not else the Triumph that forever races
around the Point which overcame me quite,
seeming embraced by that which it embraces,
- 13 Was imperceptibly immersed in light;
whereat to turn mine eyes on Beatrice,
love laid constraint on me, and lack of sight.
- 16 Could what is said of her as far as this
all in one single act of praise conclude,
it would but serve the present turn amiss.
- 19 The beauty that I saw doth so elude
our measure, that its Maker, I surely deem,
alone can taste its full beatitude.
- 22 I yield me vanquish't at this pass supreme;
comic or tragic poet overborne
was never thus by crisis of his theme.
- 25 For, as to dazzled sight the sun of morn,
so doth her sweet remembered smile erase
my memory, of its very self forlorn.
- 28 From the first day when I beheld her face
in this life, even until the present viewing,
my song yet never faltered on her trace;

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

VOL. XXI—APRIL—JUNE, 1930—No. 2

ESSAIS DE SOCIOLOGIE LINGUISTIQUE

III. PERSONNE, PERSONNAGE, PERSONNEL

M. HANS RHEINFELDER, jadis lecteur à l'Université de Rome, aujourd'hui professeur à l'Université de Fribourg (Bade), m'envoie un livre de 200 pages sur le sujet indiqué par le titre ci-dessous: *Das Wort persona, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* (77, 1928). M. Rheinfelder a divisé son travail de la manière suivante: Il distingue *personne*, "terme de théâtre"; *personne*, "terme hors du théâtre." Ce qui se subdivise en *personne*, "homme"; *personne*, "valeur"; *personne*, "membre d'une société."

M. Rheinfelder a donc, après avoir patiemment choisi ses exemples, divisé son travail en suivant les différences sémantiques de son objet. Je pense, que dans un travail de cette espèce, les différences sémantiques devraient être le résultat et non le point de départ. Il vaudrait donc mieux diviser la matière autrement pour éviter tout à priori, tout axiome, tout préjugé. Mais comment? Voilà la question. Si nous divisons un travail de linguistique selon la différence des sens d'un terme, nous transformons, au moins en partie, l'induction pure en déduction. Comment faire pour laisser sa pureté à l'induction? Essayons d'entrer dans la matière en suivant un système simplement chronologique. Pour la chronologie, il n'y a pas d'à priori, ni de doute.

1. *Moyen Age*

M. Rheinfelder explique à la page 90 sv.: "L'homme du peuple désigne le membre d'une société plus élevée par *magna persona*; mais il ne se désignera pas lui-même par *parva persona*, —pas même par *persona*." *Persona* donc, dans la langue de ce milieu, reçoit le sens de "*magna persona*." L'homme instruit, ainsi que celui qui a un rang ou de l'argent, appelle de même

tout ce qui se trouve au-dessous de lui *personae minores*. Ne se désignant pas lui-même par *persona*, le mot *personne* est vite péjorisé. Est-ce juste? D'abord, les petites gens ne forment pas un milieu hermétiquement clos: ils entendent parler le noble, le curé, le magistrat et le maître d'école, et ils imitent leurs parlers. Les classes dirigeantes ensuite ne sont pas isolées dans la réalité, comme on peut les isoler dans un travail scientifique. Étant jeunes, ils ont eu des nourrices et des bonnes; ils ont parlé avec les domestiques, le jardinier, les camarades.

Nous avons vu, dans le travail précédent, comment Louis XVI adopte le mot populaire *chandelle*. Nous avons vu que la cour de France, au Moyen Age, disait *chandelle* avec le peuple et ne disait pas *lumière* avec l'Église.

Saint Louis dit à son fils: "Je te prie que tu te faces amer au peuple de ton royaume"; il lave les pieds aux pauvres le jour "du grand jeudi." Et s'il se sert du mot *personne*, ce n'est pas du tout en grand seigneur. Il refuse de quitter le bateau en péril de mer en disant: "Je voi . . . que il a céans 800 *personnes* et plus; et pour ce que chascun aime autrement sa vie, comme je fais la moie . . . je demourrai céans pour mon peuple sauver." Tout cela tiré de l'*Histoire de Saint Louis*, par Joinville (éd. Fr. Michel, p. 1-5). Donc, Saint Louis dit *personne*, "membre de la société," sans s'occuper du rang. Joinville fait de même (p. 227): "Et estoit la terre le Roi si vague (si peu sûr) que quant il tenoit ses plez, il ne venoit pas plus de dix *personnes*." Et tous les deux se servent du même mot en parlant de la noblesse: "Les baillis et les vicomtes soient punis en leurs biens et en leurs *personnes*" (p. 226). De même, les seigneurs sont tenus "d'aler en ost en propre *personne*" (p. 226). Donc, si on dit, *en propre personne*, en parlant d'un tiers, on le dit aussi de "sa propre personne."

Il est clair que la distinction entre "biens" et "personne" de la page 221 est juridique. M. Rheinfelder l'a très bien remarqué à la page 157 de son livre (voyez la note). Du reste, cette distinction est romaine et le droit romain distingue toujours entre *persona* et *res*. Mais ces termes juridiques *en propre personne*, *en leur personne*, sont très répandus. Nous lisons dans *Bueve de Commarchis*:

As armes keurent tos, chascuns pour sa *personne*.

Ce vers a été cité par Tobler dans *Beiträge* (I, p. 32), en parlant de *personne*-pronom. Ainsi le noble qui ne dit *personne* qu'en parlant du peuple, est une fiction.

Naturellement, il y a style et style: si on lit d'autres pages du livre de Joinville, la façon de dire paraît changer. Prenez les pages 100 sv., vous trouverez:

"N'estoient pas *hommes* qui vausissent riens . . . les *barons* et plus de dix mil *personnes* . . . riches *hommes* . . . cors de *homme* . . . *home* de grant vieillesce . . . joenes *gens* . . . vieil *home* . . . de nos *gens* . . . *gens* de cest pays . . ." etc.

Au lieu de *personne*, Joinville dit généralement *homme*. Pourquoi choisit-il *personne* (p. 220 sv.)? Ce passage forme une espèce de sermon funèbre, un tableau aussi général que possible des qualités du feu Roi, de ses habitudes, de ses lois, tandis que (p. 100 sv.) Joinville raconte en fidèle chroniqueur, tâchant de peindre la vie en Orient aussi fidèlement que possible. Donc, dans la vie de tous les jours, il dit *homme* ou *gens* termes féodaux. Devant la loi, devant la mort, il emploie *personne*, terme plus général, partant plus solennel: devant la loi, devant la mort, nous sommes tous frères.

M. Rheinfelder n'a ni complètement tort, ni complètement raison, en disant que le noble ne se désigne pas lui-même par le mot *personne*. D'abord, c'est une question chronologique; ensuite, c'est une question de style. Ainsi, une division plus objective d'un travail de cette espèce serait: Distinguer les différentes périodes et, dans chaque période, les styles. Mais peut-on distinguer les styles, sans distinguer les milieux?

2. La Renaissance

Si nous passons du Moyen Age à la Renaissance, un changement s'opère: Le mot *homme*, "individu," devient plus rare; le mot *personne* devient plus fréquent dans ce même sens. Il est clair que cette observation, plutôt le fait qui la constitue, est dû à une augmentation de crédit des milieux lettrés, puisque nous avons déjà pu constater que le Moyen Age préférerait *personne* dans le haut style. Dans l'ancienne farce de *Pathelin*,

pas de *personne*, ou presque pas. On dit *homme savant*, le *bon preud'homme*, *bonhomme*, *cest homme*, *poures hommes*. Il n'y a que le juge (notez bien!) qui commence en disant: "Où est le défendeur?—Est-il cy présent *en personne*?" Pathelin a été remanié et imprimé en 1552. Dans cette édition, republiée par le Bibliophile Jacob en 1876, nous lisons:

"Quant *une telle personne* est morte,—C'est pour tout le quartier dommaige . . ."

"Non, pas pour *sa propre personne* . . ."

"Et je l'ai bien voulu adresser—*A votre personne*."

On voit le style a changé. Mais il pourrait avoir changé dans la société légiste seule, puisque l'on sait que Pathelin est sorti de la Basoche.

Demandons donc à Marguerite de Navarre la solution de ce doute. Nous trouvons dans son *Heptaméron*, entre autres (car il est impossible de citer tous les exemples):

I, 5: "Il y en a qui ont refusé des *personnes* plus agréables que ung cordelier"; I, 3: "Je ne nommerai les *personnes* . . ."; I, 7: "Qui vous nommeroit les *personnes* . . ."; I, 9: "changer les noms des *personnes* . . ."; II, 11: "Connaissant les *personnes* . . ."; III, 21: "Il n'y fait si pesant que l'amour de deux *personnes* bien unies ne puisse supporter . . ."; V, 46: "la *personne* soupçonneuse ne peut entretenir un parfait ami."

En somme, Marguerite désigne par le mot *personne* tous les figurants de ses contes, ainsi que l'homme se distinguant des autres hommes par quelque trait de caractère spécial. Mais, remarque très importante, elle ne les désigne ainsi que dans les conversations qui suivent ses contes, conversations de courtisans, comme on se le rappelle. Tandis que dans les contes mêmes il n'y a pas de *personnes* ou presque pas.

Les rôles du mot *personne* ont donc été renversés par la Renaissance. *Personne*, latinisme un peu lourd et abstrait, se trouvait au Moyen Age là où le style était solennel, élevé, savant, devant la loi, devant la mort. Maintenant, le mot appartient à la conversation, à la langue orale des courtisans de Marguerite, mais on l'évite dans les contes, dans la langue écrite.

3. *Mélioration et Péjoration*

Je n'ai trouvé aucune trace du prétendu terme admiratif et populaire de M. Rheinfelder: *personne*, "magna persona." Aucune trace du prétendu terme péjorisé et aristocratique: *personne*, "parva persona." Au contraire, *personne* paraît précisément incolore à Saint Louis, à Joinville, à Marguerite. *Personne* est tout le monde et tout le monde est "personne." Sans cela, *personne* n'aurait pas pu devenir pronom, négation, abstraction. Il n'y a *personne*, c'est l'abstraction par excellence.

Toutefois, nous lisons dans le *Nouveau Pathelin: une telle personne*, dans le sens de "grande personne." Mais c'est *telle* qui a l'accent et non *personne*. Ce qui est sûr, c'est que, pendant la Renaissance, on disait *personnage* pour augmenter la valeur de l'idée de "personne": "Un personnage de mes amis," dit le Roi Hircan dans l'*Heptaméron* (6). "Moi qui connais les deux personnages" est dit au Roi François et d'un comte (17). "Qui aurait connu le personnage comme moi, . . . je n'ai point vu un plus beau gentilhomme" (26), etc. Ici, en effet, il s'agit d'une mélioration: le terme *personne* passe sans épithète. Ainsi, il paraît clair que, si l'on dit *personnage* pour augmenter la valeur de *personne*, *personne* sous la forme simple ne saurait suffire à l'amplification.

Toutefois, il serait hasardeux d'en conclure que l'on n'a dit *personnage* que parce que *personne* était trop incolore. En effet, comme nous allons voir, *personnage* n'est pas du tout dérivé du mot *personne* tout court, ou trop court, mais du mot *personatus*, "dignitaire possédant un fief." Du reste, au Moyen Age, *personne*, "dignitaire," existait aussi. Mais c'était un terme purement ecclésiastique: "Persona dicitur in ecclesia qui habet dignitatem pro ceteris" (Voyez *Isengimus*, éd. E. Vogt, à l'Index). Et notez bien: *in ecclesia*! "Aime tous (sic) les personnes de sainte église," a dit Saint Louis (Voyez Joinville, *Saint Louis*, p. 238-9). L'anglais *parson*, "curé," "nom de famille," en dérive.

C'est un chapitre que M. Rheinfelder a très bien documenté. Mais il n'a pas souligné que ce *personne*, méliorisé, n'appartient ni au peuple, ni à l'aristocratie, mais au clergé seul. Et de

même *personne* péjorisé n'appartient ni au peuple, ni à l'aristocratie, mais au clergé seul. Ainsi nous lisons dans le *Besant Dieu*:

683 "Et les *personnes* que feront
Qui les riches iglises ont,
Treis ou quatre en une province,
Que diront-il devant le prince?"

Ce qui est dit du jugement dernier: le prince, c'est "Jésus," et les *personnes* ne sont pas prises dans un sens mélioratif.

Donc, ce que M. Rheinfelder avait essayé de généraliser sociologiquement n'est pas généralisable. C'est le haut clergé seul qui est désigné par *persona*, "dignitaire." C'est dans le clergé seul, naturellement dans le petit clergé, que *persona* dignitaire est péjorisé. Et c'est encore le petit clergé qui forme de *personne*, "dignitaire," un néologisme *personaus*, "hautain," "égoïste." M. Rheinfelder a trouvé le mot, mais il n'a pas osé l'expliquer.

C'est le Renclus de Moiliens qui chante des

"plus *personaus*
de ces grans abés crocheniers."

Or, le Renclus de Moiliens est un mécontent, un révolutionnaire dans l'Église. Et voilà la solution de l'énigme: il y a "clergé" et "clergé"; ce qui paraît bon pour l'évêque ou l'abbé, est mauvais pour le simple clerc ou le curé de village. Ce sont ces derniers qui parleront de ces *grands abés personaus et crocheniers*.

M. Rheinfelder remarque à la page 122: "Je ne sais pas si *personnel* est formé de *personne*, 'dignitaire ecclésiastique' ou si ce mot a le sens de 'digne' . . . en ce cas, ce sens aurait la nuance de quelqu'un qui se prélassé, 'praelatenhaft.'" M. Rheinfelder n'a pas remarqué que personnel en français moderne a encore le même sens d'"antisocial," d'"égoïste." Et il n'a pas remarqué qu'il a lui-même noté ce même sens pour l'italien ainsi que pour l'espagnol, mais à des pages distantes de sa remarque sur le Renclus. Il note parfaitement bien: *sentimento personale*, "egoïsme," pour l'italien, et *personalismo*, "égoïsme," en espagnol. Il aurait donc fallu un système qui réunit *per-*

sonaus, ancien français, *personne*, français moderne, et les variantes des autres langues romanes, au lieu de les séparer. S'il avait rigoureusement séparé le milieu ecclésiastique des autres milieux, s'il avait distingué dans ce milieu le haut et le petit clergé, les curés et les moines, je crois que forcément il aurait trouvé le lien qui unit *personaus*, *personnel*, *personalismo* et *sentimento personale*.

4. *Personnel*, "égoïste"

Mon plus ancien exemple de *personnel*, "égoïste," en français moderne date de Saint-Simon. Il fait partie de son portrait si dûment célèbre de Louis XIV: "C'étoit un homme uniquement *personnel*, et qui ne comptoit tous les autres que par rapport à soi" (II, chap. 21).

Je retrouve ce terme à la cour jusqu'à la Révolution. Marie-Antoinette s'en sert (Frères Goncourt, *Marie-Antoinette*, p. 292). Dans les *Manuscrits de M. Necker publiés par sa fille* (exemplaire de ma bibliothèque), nous trouvons l'article suivant:

§ 102 personnalité—"On dit communément qu'il est permis aux grands hommes d'être *personnels*, qu'on doit au moins le leur pardonner . . . mais s'ils étoient *personnels* en gloire . . . il y aurait un grand reproche à leur faire . . . l'homme *personnel* en gloire, s'il avait en main la toute-puissance, frapperoit à jamais de stérilité l'esprit et le génie."

On trouvera d'autres exemples dans Littré.

Donc maintenant, deux questions se posent: le mot *personaus* du Renclus et le mot *personnel*, "égoïste," mot en usage depuis le XVIII^e siècle, sont-ils les mêmes? Le mot français *personnel*, "égoïste," et les termes italiens et espagnols, *personalismo* et *sentimento personale*, dérivent-ils d'une même source? Ou bien, sont-ce des néologismes que le génie de chaque langue a créés librement? Entre le *personaus* du Renclus et le *personnel* de Saint-Simon je n'ai pas trouvé de lien. Les classiques écrivent amour-propre, vanité, orgueil, mais ils n'écrivent ni *personnalité*, ni *personnel* dans ce sens. Il n'y a qu'un passage des *Lettres Provinciales* qui, peut-être, forme exception. Nous lisons dans la troisième lettre vers la fin: "Ce ne sont pas les sentimens de

M. Arnould qui sont hérétiques, ce n'est que sa *personne*; c'est une hérésie *personnelle*." Toute hérésie est personnelle. Donc, ce *personnel* paraît contenir un sens différent du sens général du mot. Est-ce un reproche adressé à la personnalité des Jésuites?

Un de mes amis comprend ce *personnel* de Pascal autrement: il ne peut pas y avoir d'hérésie pour la *personne* d'un individu, mais seulement pour ses *idées*. Donc, accuser quelqu'un d'hérésie personnelle, cela s'appelle lui imputer une impossibilité. Car une hérésie est dans les idées de la personne, ou elle n'est pas.

En tout cas, il n'y a pas de lien français entre le *persona*us du Renclus et le *personnel* de Saint-Simon. Mais les formes *personalismo* et *sentimento personale* révèlent la source: Le lien entre le *persona*us du Renclus, le *personnel* de Saint-Simon, le *sentimento personale* italien et le *personalismo* espagnol ne saurait être autre que le terme latin, *personalis*. Il est fréquent en latin, rare en langue vulgaire, et, de là, les difficultés que nous venons de rencontrer. En effet, *personale* est un terme de Droit Romain. C'est Rome qui distinguait le "*beneficium personale*" du "*beneficium reale*." Idée et terme sont adoptés par le droit médiéval et, au Moyen Age, ils appartiennent aussi bien au droit temporel qu'à l'Église. Voyez les exemples de Du Cange de l'année 1103: "*ante Gofridum filium comitis et alios personales viros*"; 1107: "*ab omni personale redemptione liberas*"; 1268: "*beneficium personale*"; 1591: "*personatus vel beneficia personalia*."

Le clerc écrivait donc aussi bien *personales viros*, en parlant de princes qu'en parlant d'évêques. Ainsi que *personne* dans le haut clergé, ce *personalis* a un accent mélioratif dans le grand monde, mais cette fois-ci dans le grand monde de l'Église *et des cours*. Ayant un accent mélioratif dans le grand monde, il tend à être péjorisé dans le petit. Voilà donc, à mon idée, le *persona*us du Renclus très bien expliqué: c'est un latinisme méliorisé par le grand monde et péjorisé par le petit clergé et les courtisans.

Ce latinisme reste une source perpétuelle de péjoration. Les courtisans rencontrent le terme et l'idée dans la leçon de morale, dans l'enseignement du droit temporel et ecclésiastique, dans la

confession. Ils apprennent que les *personales viri*, ce sont ceux qui possèdent un *beneficium personale*, autrement dit un *personatus*. Les biens de l'Église, aussi bien que les biens personnels, étaient accordés ou bien personnellement, ou bien réellement. Les avoir personnellement, c'était les posséder. C'étaient les Grands qui possédaient personnellement, qui étaient donc des personnages.

Toutes ces idées, tous ces termes jouaient un grand rôle dans la confession. Les confesseurs de cour étant en général des Jésuites, je m'adresse à un de ces confesseurs incriminés par Pascal et je choisis le traité d'Escobar, *Liber Theologiae Moralis* (édition de Munich, 1646, exemplaire de la Bibliothèque de l'Université de Munich):

P. 78: "Les serments se font par la commune ou *personaliter*"; p. 192: "La Dime se paye ou bien *praedialis*, en nature, ou bien *personalis*, en numéraire"; p. 195: "*Personalis* est decima pars fructum provenientium ex industria et opera (sic) *personae*"; p. 197: "*Beneficium personale* quod conceditur immediate *personae*"; p. 200: "*privilegium personale* sequitur *personam*"; p. 461: (article *feudum*) "le *servitium personale* demande un *obsequium personale*."

Ces exemples ne sont pas cherchés. Je les ai pris au fur et à mesure. Le mot *personnel* était de rigueur dans la confession, et surtout dans celle des courtisans. Il revenait sans cesse au chapitre des bénéfices, des privilèges et du service.

La péjoration de ce mot *personnel*, "digne," "sacré," se disait, mais ne s'écrivait pas. Le révolutionnaire qu'était le duc de Saint-Simon est le premier à écrire le terme sérieusement, en parlant du Roi. Ensuite viennent les exemples que j'ai tirés de Necker et d'autres. Ils montrent que le terme est reçu à la Cour. Aujourd'hui il est français. Et nous lisons dans le *Temps* du 3 avril 1929, à propos de l'enseignement du français dans le sud de l'Afrique: "Ce sont donc des Hollandais ou des Suisses, notoirement calvinistes, qui l'enseignent, et j'ai pu constater que leur français était plutôt *personnel*." On dirait que ce sont encore les milieux ecclésiastiques qui emploient ce mot de préférence. Huysmans au moins s'en sert assez souvent dans ses romans catholiques, par exemple dans l'*Oblat*:

L'art de la fugue et du contrepoint lui paraît "personnel et vaniteux" (chapitre 3, p. 51). Il raconte à la page 57 qu'il est défendu aux moines de dire *ma fourchette* et *mon couteau*. Il faut dire *notre fourchette* et *notre couteau*. "Il va de soi," continue l'auteur, "que ce mode *impersonnel* de dire les choses, ne s'applique qu'à ce qui est commun, donc aux ustensiles." Un des moines, un moniste sans doute, généralise la règle en disant: "Je crois, mon frère, que j'ai marché sur notre pied."

Ainsi le *persona* du Renclus, le français moderne *personnel*, "égoïste," ont une source commune, qui ne tarit pas, le latin ecclésiastique. Est-ce la même source qui a produit un terme plus international encore: *personnel*, "l'ensemble des personnes qui constituent un service," allemand *Personal*, italien *personale*? C'est un terme qui, lui aussi, est en usage dans les couvents, voyez l'*Oblat* aux pages 405 et 412. C'est l'abbé qui dit: "J'ai besoin de tout mon *personnel* là-bas et il va être bien réduit."

5. Une Belle Personne

Le chapitre précédent a montré qu'il est impossible, en linguistique, de s'arrêter au Moyen Age. Le *persona* du Renclus reste incompréhensible sans le français moderne, sans le latin de l'Église et de l'école. Il est impossible de comprendre le Moyen Age sans suivre les traces du mot latin jusqu'à l'usage moderne. Il est impossible de comprendre l'usage moderne, sans avoir étudié le Moyen Age.

En outre, un travail linguistique, voulant atteindre la vie même des mots, ne saurait reposer sur les lexiques seuls. Les lexiques ne donnent pas, en général, de distinctions sociologiques. Ainsi, leurs distinctions sémantiques ne reposent pas sur la réalité, qui est toujours dans l'individu et dans les groupes, mais plutôt sur des suppositions parfois assez vagues. Il faut donc partir, dans un travail linguistique, de l'homme particulier, de l'auteur, en étudiant le milieu, la période, ne pas remplacer une nation par un milieu ecclésiastique, ne pas étudier le monde lettré en choisissant un modèle purement artistique. C'est alors que ce qui est personnel et ce qui ne l'est pas, ce qui est original et ce qui est commun à un groupe, ce qui est convention

et ce qui est style se détache. Et, ce qui a été style pour un groupe précédent, peut devenir la convention, la règle pour les jeunes.

Ainsi au XVIII^e siècle *personne*, "individu," tend à disparaître dans la haute littérature, *belle personne*, "terme galant," a tellement impressionné la sensualité de certains milieux modernes que le terme érotique a éliminé ou presque, chez beaucoup d'auteurs, le terme incolore de *personne*, "individu des deux sexes." D'abord, en lisant Beaumarchais, je remarque:

Barbier de Séville, I, 4: "une jeune *personne* d'une beauté . . ."; II, 2: "la *personne* qu'il aime . . ."; "Cette *personne* est la pupille de votre tuteur . . .". *Figaro*, I, 5: "Une si jolie *personne* que Madame . . ." etc.

Du reste, hormis *personne*, pronom, pas de *personne*. Et ce n'est que l'avocat Bridoison qui dit des horreurs comme: "*personne* n'épouserait *personne*." Depuis quand cette mode? Je cherche dans Marivaux, parce que c'est lui qui, vers 1730-1740, écrit la langue la moins littéraire. Et voici ce que je trouve:

Marianne: ". . . cinq ou six *personnes* . . ."; "les *personnes* tuées . . ."; "quelques *personnes* étendues mortes . . ."; "deux *personnes*, une dame et un cavalier . . ."

Tout cela tiré des quatre premières pages d'une édition quelconque. Marivaux se sert du terme incolore *personne* à chaque page. Mais la *belle* et *jeune personne* a déjà fait son entrée. Dans la seconde partie du *Paysan Parvenu*, aussitôt qu'Agathe paraît, elle est qualifiée de *jeune personne* et de *petite personne*.

Il faut donc chercher plus loin que 1730. Le plus ancien exemple que je parvienne à trouver de *personne*, "femme," est celui du *Baron de Phoeneste* (Livre II, chapitre 14). La bonne amie d'un curé, voulant lui dire que, pendant son absence, elle a été importunée par un individu, lui dit *sub specie rosae*:

"Il y a des *personnes* qui font bonne mine aux *personnes*, que si les *personnes* savaient la fidélité des *personnes* . . ."

C'est un jeu de mots basé sur trois sens différents du mot *personne*. Le premier *personne*, c'est "quelqu'un," le deuxième, c'est une "femme." *Faire bonne mine aux personnes*, c'est comme si l'on disait: Faire la cour aux femmes. Le troisième *personne*, c'est le "curé," et le quatrième, c'est encore la "femme." Ce double sens reste admissible pendant le XVII^e siècle. D'un côté, on dit *auguste personne* en parlant du Roi; on dit *sage personne* en parlant d'un magistrat. De l'autre côté, on dit *belle, jeune, charmante personne*, en parlant du sexe. On trouvera beaucoup d'exemples de cette façon de parler dans la *Muze Historique* de Loret. Ce n'est que vers 1750 qu'arrive ce que nous avons indiqué plus haut: *personne*, "quelqu'un," devient rare.

Donc, au XVIII^e siècle, nous distinguons deux périodes: Dans la *première*, on abuse de *personne*, "individu," mais *jeune personne, petite personne*, terme galant, est reçu. Dans la *seconde*, le terme galant a failli éliminer, dans un certain milieu bien entendu, le terme général et incolore. Précisons la date de cette élimination, ainsi que nous croyons avoir précisé la date de l'apparition de *personne*, "femme." Je choisis, pour des raisons faciles à deviner, la *Nouvelle Héloïse* de Jean-Jacques:

Lettre première (écrite à Julie): "Une *personne* si raisonnable . . ."

Lettre cinquième (de même): "Les charmes de ta *personne* . . ."

Le sexe masculin est, en général, désigné par *homme*. Il n'y a que la lettre 18, où il soit question de *quelques personnes* dans un sens incolore.

Mais la sensualité de ce roman, sa galanterie, sont tellement recouvertes de tendresse et de sentiment, que, il faut en convenir, j'ai mal choisi ma lecture. J'aurais dû m'adresser aux *Confessions* où apparaît le vrai Rousseau, le Rousseau des jours de semaine, sensuel et libertin. Et, en effet, les premières impressions sexuelles reçues du fait de ses tantes, lui font dire:

Premier livre, p. 22 de mon édition de 1793: "Je dévorai d'un œil ardent les *belles personnes*. . . Mes trois tantes

n'étoient pas seulement des *personnes* d'une sagesse exemplaire. . . . J'ai ainsi passé ma vie à convoiter et me taire auprès des *personnes* que j'aimais le plus," etc.

Dans les *Confessions*, *personne* est dit en parlant de belles femmes qui tentent l'auteur et rarement en parlant d'hommes en général. Rousseau est-il le père de ce trait stylistique et sémantique caractérisant si bien le Rococo? C'est bien possible. Mais il faudrait des études très spéciales pour répondre oui ou non. Et ce qui m'intéresse dans ces articles, c'est moins le résultat définitif que la méthode qui y conduit.

6. Personnage et Personnalité

Après avoir fait la connaissance de la péjoration de *personnel*, il n'est pas difficile de prévoir que *personnage*, "celui qui tient un *personatus*," lui aussi est voué à la péjoration. Mais il serait impossible de déduire de quelle idée et par quel détour cette péjoration a évolué. Il n'y a que l'induction qui l'explique. Au XVI^e siècle, *personnage* est encore le synonyme de "grande personne," ainsi que nous l'avons trouvé dans Marguerite de Navarre et dans Amyot. Voilà peut-être pourquoi le drame classique a changé le terme de *personne dramatique* en *personnage*.

Mais n'allons pas trop vite. Robert Garnier a d'abord dit *acteurs*, puis plus tard *entreparleurs*! Évidemment, on a voulu distinguer entre "personnages du drame" et "acteurs," "comédiens," et on a cherché un néologisme pour éviter l'équivoque. Pourquoi pas *personne* comme au Moyen Age? A cause du Moyen Age? Ou parce que *personne* est devenu trop général? Et pourquoi justement *personnage*? Parce que *personnage* avait un accent mélioratif? Et que la scène classique n'admettait que la haute société, dans laquelle il n'y avait que des personnages?

Hélas! La vérité est en général bien différente de ce que nous en imaginons par déduction ou par intuition. D'abord, si, au Moyen Age, on dit *personne*, ce n'est pas cela qui aurait déterminé les dramaturges du XVI^e siècle à se défaire de ce mot, car *persona dramatis*, c'est le terme classique. Donc, si, en vérité, *personne* avait été trop incolore comme terme français, il

aurait pu passer comme latinisme. Mais, évidemment, le théâtre du XVI^e siècle a eu sa diction particulière, indépendante du Moyen Age aussi bien que de l'antiquité. Et acteur, signifiant "celui qui agit," on s'en est servi pour désigner le "personnage" aussi bien que "celui qui le joue" jusqu'au XVII^e siècle (Voir *Dictionnaire Général*). Ce qui est sûr, c'est que Garnier, en remplaçant *acteur* par *entrepasseur*, a eu l'intention d'éviter le double sens d'acteur. Il n'a du reste pas inventé le mot *entrepasseur*, mais il l'a traduit de l'italien *interlocutori*, dont se sert, par exemple, Machiavel.

Plus tard, on a remplacé ce terme un peu lourd par *personnage*. Quand? Les plus anciens exemples de *personnage*, "rôle," du *Dictionnaire Général* sont tirés des Classiques, surtout de Molière. Mon premier exemple est beaucoup plus ancien. Je trouve la première liste de personnages dans la traduction française du *Pastor Fido: Le Berger fidèle* (Paris, 1595, exemplaire de ma bibliothèque). Et l'original italien portait: *le persone che parlanno*. Donc, évidemment, on a évité *personne* et on a choisi *personnage* comme remplaçant. Impossible de fixer la cause. Les détails manquent. On sait que l'histoire du théâtre à la fin du XVI^e siècle est remplie de lacunes (Voyez le chapitre 2 du *Théâtre français avant la période classique*, par Eugène Rigal). La seule chose que nous sachions, c'est que *personnage*, "rôle," apparaît vers 1595 pour la première fois (?). L'usage du mot, naturellement, peut être plus ancien. On paraît avoir voulu éviter *personne*. A cause de sa polysémie? A cause de son sens négatif, là où *personne* est isolé, formant phrase à lui seul? Ce qui est sûr, c'est qu'on a voulu distinguer *acteur*, "rôle," et *acteur*, "comédien"; ce qui est possible, c'est que l'italien *persona* a eu son influence sur le choix du terme *personnage*; ce qui peut avoir décidé le choix, c'est l'accent, l'acteur n'ayant à jouer que des *personnages*.

Et voilà donc *personnage*, "rôle," introduit dans le français. "Vous ne pouvez pas soutenir ce *personnage* difficile," dira Figaro (*Barbier*, I, 4). C'est maintenant que *personnage* se péjorise. Car qui joue un rôle, est un comédien, n'est pas franc. *Quel est ce personnage* veut donc dire: "Quel est cet homme qui n'est pas à sa place." Ce doit être alors qu'on

remplace *personnage* dans le sens objectif de "somme totale des qualités d'une personne" par un néologisme, *personnalité*. Néologisme pour le sens, mais non pour la forme. Car *personnalité* est un terme juridique assez ancien et assez répandu (Voyez Rheinfelder, p. 58). Mon plus ancien exemple du néologisme *personnalité*, "total de qualités," se trouve dans les *Mémoires du Comte de Ségur: Souvenirs et anecdotes sur le Règne de Louis XVI*, éd. F. Funck-Brentano (p. 92): "Des personnalités universellement estimées." On ne dit plus *personnage* en ce sens. Ce qui n'empêche pas l'historien réaliste de traiter ses héros en *personnages* là où, véritablement, ils ont joué un rôle. Voir, par exemple, les portraits littéraires de Sainte-Beuve. La Fayette a eu son rôle, "plus que tout autre personnage de la Révolution"; on étudie La Fayette "dans son personnage politique," etc.

Ainsi, malgré sa péjoration, *personnage* reste, dans la littérature, l'amélioration, l'augmentation de *personne*, comme le prouve incontestablement le passage suivant de Balzac, tiré du quatrième chapitre de l'*Interdiction*:

"Paris, où la mode élève, abaisse tour à tour des *personnages* qui, tantôt grands, tantôt petits, c'est-à-dire tour à tour en vue et oubliés, deviennent plus tard des *personnes* insupportables comme le sont les ministres disgraciés."

Si on prive le *personnage* de son rôle, il ne reste que la *personne insupportable*.

Conclusion

Ainsi l'histoire de *personne*, de *personnel*, de *personnalité*, de *personnage* (surtout de ce dernier) ne laisse pas d'être dramatique. Mais il est inutile de chercher le drame dans les dictionnaires, ou dans les abstractions idéalistes. Le drame est toujours dans le concret, dans la réalité, dans l'homme particulier. La réalité est toujours dans l'individu, dans les groupes d'individus, dans les rapports si labiles d'individu à individu. Ce sont ces rapports qui font l'objet des études sociologiques. N'oublions donc jamais que "milieu," "famille," "société," sont des abstractions exactes, si on les observe en distinguant les individus qui les forment,—fausses, si on les étudie abstraitement, en

étudiant, par exemple, l'homme par l'humanité, la langue par son génie, le fait par une formule idéaliste.

Non, au contraire, il faut étudier l'humanité par l'homme qui la compose, qui en forme l'unité, le seul élément réel, palpable. Il faut étudier le fait par les éléments concrets dont il forme le rapport, la langue par ceux qui la parlent. Car toute abstraction est juste qui part du concret pour aller vers l'abstrait, qui part du fait particulier pour aller vers ce qui est général, en faisant, en route, abstraction de tout ce qui est spécial, personnel, original. Ce n'est que dans ce sens que la définition spirituelle, mais dangereuse, de Taine, "Tout abstrait est l'extrait d'un concret," est admissible. L'*abstrait* n'est pas "l'extrait d'un concret," mais "la somme d'extraits de beaucoup de faits concrets pareils et parents." Et la formule de Taine est un exemple excellent pour montrer que ce qui est spirituel n'est pas toujours juste et que ce qui est bien dit peut être absolument faux, hélas!

Toutefois un ami a essayé de sauver Taine en disant qu'il a voulu dire exactement la même chose que j'ai dite, moi. Que *un concret* veut dire, dans la langue de Taine, "l'ensemble de beaucoup de concrets." Mais alors ce n'est plus un concret, mais un abstrait. Et voilà pourquoi la définition de Taine reste aussi spirituelle que fausse. Car, si on comprend *un concret*, comme si on avait dit "un ensemble de beaucoup de concrets," cela équivaldrait à "un abstrait de beaucoup de concrets." On n'a donc pas dit autre chose que "l'abstrait est l'extrait d'un abstrait," ce qui revient à une simple tautologie. L'abstraction procède par l'analyse de ce qui est commun aux individus et aux faits d'une même classe, par l'analyse de ce qui est original, personnel, unique dans les individus et les faits. Ainsi l'abstraction est toute dans les rapports des personnes et des choses. L'*abstraction* est la "représentation par idées de rapports réels."

Classer les individus et les faits par leurs rapports réels, les analyser et en abstraire ce qui leur est commun, en déduire ce qui est original à l'individu ou à la classe, voilà la méthode que nous appelons *induction*. Elle est de rigueur dans la science, partout où les individus concrets ne font pas défaut. Procéder

par déduction là où l'induction est praticable, c'est ce que nous appelons le *dilettantisme*.

M. Rheinfelder a procédé par l'induction, dans son travail, en rassemblant une belle collection des dérivés du mot latin *persona*, collection basée sur une connaissance irréprochable de la langue. Ce que j'ai voulu montrer dans cette étude critique, c'est que, s'il avait divisé cette collection d'après les milieux et les auteurs qui la lui avaient fournie, au lieu de la diviser d'après le sens des locutions en question fixé au préalable, son étude aurait abouti à un rendement plus définitif et se rapprochant de plus près de la réalité, c'est-à-dire des auteurs et de leurs milieux, des hommes et de leurs rapports multiples.

LEO JORDAN

UNIVERSITÉ DE MUNICH

FRANCESCA DA RIMINI AND THE
DOLCE STIL NUOVO

✓ THE episode of Francesca da Rimini (Inferno V) is beset by a deep contradiction. Francesca, as a sinner, is in the second circle of Hell, where those who have yielded to lust are tossed about by a raging storm, but in the episode she stands as a glorification of Love. Does Dante glorify the sinner in her? If so, why should he have placed Francesca in Hell? If not, why should he have presented her in the light of sympathy which he diffused around her? Here lies the contradiction which we wish to solve.

The apparent inconsistency has been felt by several critics who have dealt with it according to their interpretation of the episode and of Dante's entire poem. Dall'Ongaro evades the issue by saying that it is a "sublime contradiction."¹ Foscolo believes that Dante's attitude toward Francesca was actuated by his gratitude to her family, as he had been a guest of her father, Guido da Polenta, and of her nephew, Guido Novello. Ginguené goes further and states that Paolo and Francesca are not really damned.² Francesco de Sanctis faces the issue but solves it in a way that needs a brief discussion. "Those two go together," states the great critic in rejecting Ginguené's theory, "and they love each other even through eternity, not because they are not damned, but, indeed, because they are damned."³ He explains his attitude by pointing out that in Hell all earthly conditions are made eternal and remain unchanged, as in the case of Filippo Argenti and Capaneo. True, but sin in the case of the latter two is their penalty. Filippo Argenti had yielded to wrath and through wrath he is punished. Capaneo had defied God and his own curses are his punishment. Virgil rebukes him thus:

¹ Francesco De Sanctis, *Nuovi Saggi Critici*, 1872, p. 14.

² *Ibid.*, p. 1.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

"O Capaneo, in ciò che non s'ammorza
La tua superbia, se' tu piu punito;
Nullo martirio, fuor che la tua rabbia,
Sarebbe al tuo furor dolor compito."⁴

"There is not the slightest detail on which the word 'sin' is not written,"⁵ concludes De Sanctis, using the presence of sin to fashion a Francesca not different from a woman of contemporary fiction and seeing in Dante a forerunner of the realistic writers. Living in the age of Naturalism and reacting against the emptiness of the decadent Romanticism, De Sanctis tinged his criticism of Dante with his realistic aesthetic belief to the point that, to him, Francesca is the first real woman who has appeared in Italian literature, one who has eclipsed Beatrice and Laura, who are, to him, mere concepts of a feminine ideal. Benedetto Croce follows entirely De Sanctis' point of view, emphasizing even more the presence of passion in the episode. "Their love was a true love, complete and real, soulful, sensuous, with gentle and delicate aspirations, the ecstasy of beatitude; languor, abandon, perdition."⁶

To us, however, Francesca is Beatrice's sister and, if this can be proven, we propose to draw conclusions about Dante and his art which are very different from those of the above-mentioned critics. Francesco De Sanctis tried to remove the contradiction in the episode by glorifying Francesca's sin; we, on the other hand, shall try to show how Dante glorified Francesca in the name of Love as the *Dolce Stil Nuovo* conceived it.

When we find Dante in the circle of the lustful ones, he sternly and objectively points out the sinners who are punished in it:

"Intesi ch'a così fatto tormento
Enno dannati i peccator carnali,
Che la ragion sommettono al talento."

A storm rages in an atmosphere "mute of every light" and it tosses the spirits in the midst of shrieking cries, moans and laments. Dante wants to know the names of the sinners and

⁴ Dante, *Inferno*, XIV, 63-66.

⁵ Francesco De Sanctis, *Nuovi Saggi Critici*, 1872, p. 15.

⁶ Benedetto Croce, *Poesia di Dante*, 1921, p. 77.

Virgil mentions Semiramis, Dido, Cleopatra, Helen of Troy, Achilles, Paris and Tristan. There is a vast difference between the way in which Dante refers to the sinners as an abstract moralist and his attitude toward the great lovers of antiquity and history. He is, to be sure, severe with Semiramis:

"Che libito fe'licito in sua legge"

but when Virgil mentions Dido:

"che s'ancise amorosa"

and Helen and Achilles, Cleopatra, Paris and Tristan, Dante's heart is filled with pity and he is almost overcome:

"Pietà mi vinse e fui quasi smarrito."

It seems that the key to the whole episode lies in this changed state of mind that gradually lets the episode drift away from the main narrative and gives to it a unity of its own. We, too, as we read, forget the sinners and the entire circle where lust is punished. As Dante listens to Virgil mentioning the great lovers of antiquity, he is no longer looking at their sin; he feels himself lost in the dream and beauty which are diffused around them. This attitude is quite natural in one who evokes memories of the great lovers of the past and looks at them through time which shrouds in solemn silence the deeds of man. Sin sinks into oblivion and only the noble transport of the human heart remains. The language itself in referring to the celebrated lovers has changed, and the strength of the first lines of the canto is followed by a musical sequel of *terzine*, light and luminous. Of Dido, he says that "s'ancise amorosa" and of all the other shadows that

"Amor di questa vita dipartille."

These *terzine* serve not only as a background to the episode, but they also show the change which has taken place in Dante's mind. In the presence of the great lovers of history, that which appeared lust to Dante, the moralist, has become love to Dante, the dreamer. A dreamer is not necessarily the man, and even less, the poet, who is ignorant of the negative and

relative sides of human nature. He is the man, and especially the poet, who ignores the negative and relative in the name of what is positive and absolute in the deeds of man, rising to love's loftier levels and forgetting the weakness of the flesh.

In the *Vita Nuova*, Dante's life exists, so to say, on two planes, on one side his stormy and passionate youth, on the other the sublime love for Beatrice. Beatrice represented for him an ideal embodiment of love which was marred and offended by the presence of other women in his life. To us, the women of the foil are not a mere imitation of a literary device used by the Troubadours, but real women for whom Dante did not feel the same Platonic love that Beatrice awakened in his heart. Were it not so, Beatrice would not have denied him her greeting, as Dante tells us:

"And for this reason, that is to say, for this widespread rumor that seemed to cast on me the infamy of vice, that most gentle lady . . . denied me her greeting which was all my beatitude."⁷

When Dante meets Forese in Purgatory, we learn from the poet's own lips how turbulent his youth had been, and we still possess an insulting sonnet written by the lofty poet of mysticism about Forese's wife. A fundamentally different Dante from the lover in the *Vita Nuova* appears in the *Rime Pietrose* in which he sings of his violent passion for a woman to whom he refers as Pietra. Guido Cavalcanti, in one of his sonnets, with tenderness and concern, grieves over the manner in which his dear friend, Dante, wastes his youth. In the *Vita Nuova* there is but a faint echo, and well disguised, of this turbulence, while Dante's youth appears suffused with the light that Beatrice casts on it. The *Vita Nuova* represents a frantic projection in the world of the absolute, a flight to a lofty plane in order to forget the tormenting struggle of a sensuous youth. Dante is plainly conscious of this projection into the realm of the absolute as we can see from a passage in the very beginning of the book:

"and since to dwell on passions and deeds of such extreme youthfulness seems a sort of language worthy of fable, I shall

⁷ *Vita Nuova*, Chapter X.

leave this aside and . . . shall come to those words that are written in my memory under more important headings." ⁸

In his quest for a higher plane and a nobler style, shunning the lowness of the "fabula," Dante chooses to relate the more important events of his life that refer to his love for Beatrice. In this fashion, he leaves out the struggle that he underwent to curb his violent and passionate nature. Had he not done so, he would have realized an aesthetic canon that became the accepted basis of art only in the nineteenth century. Love, with its relative characteristics, love in its becoming, does not appear in the *Vita Nuova*. Still less it appears in the *Commedia* where Beatrice, radiant with the beauty of immortality, leads him to the very pinnacle of human perfection, which is the contemplation of Truth and of God. Dante saw in Beatrice Love, pure Love, because he had in his soul the power to forget her body and to replace it by a spiritualized being. To imagine him ignorant of the human side is to follow in the foot-prints of Biscioni, Rossetti, or of Perez, who only saw in her an allegory and not a real person. Dante presents his love for Beatrice after he has purified it of all elements of passion. His story begins on the luminous threshold of Ideal, leaving out what appeared negative to him and what might disturb his dream. If we do not keep this in mind, the *Dolce Stil Nuovo* and almost the entire *Commedia* lose their meaning and value for us.

Dante's century was an age of sublime synthesis, in which all aspects of life were harmonized. In the early centuries of the Middle Ages, Asceticism had despised the human body. In the thirteenth century, on the contrary, Mysticism accepted all the earthly realities and lent them a spiritual significance. Dante, in the *Vita Nuova*, gave us the luminous tangibility of Beatrice's beauty, and his theory was that we are attracted by the tangible and bodily charms, but that we must rise through them to the contemplation of the absolute and eternal beauty. His love for Beatrice was interwoven with the moral problem of his youth, and Beatrice stood before him as the giver of a moral rhythm to his life. Love was to him spiritual affinity between gentle persons and, as such, it was sung by all the

⁸ *Ibid.*, Chapter II.

songsters of the *Dolce Stil Nuovo*. It is the same with Francesca da Rimini as with Beatrice. Dante saw in her the lover, he gave her his own feelings and only a luminous, gentle lady stood before him. This shows that in the *Commedia* there remained the same attitude toward love as had been expressed in the *Vita Nuova*, the marvelous book which grew under the influence of the ideals of the *Dolce Stil Nuovo*.

It has been the custom to point out that a gap exists between the *Vita Nuova*, expression of Dante's idealism, and the *Commedia*, embodiment of Dante's realism. This leads to the question: was Dante a realist and in what sense was he a realist? Dante's reality was in the conscience of man and not in the world of senses. He was a Neo-Platonist. The great value of the *Commedia* lies in the fact that it portrays Dante's victorious journey to a moment of supreme inner quietude sought in vain through an active and stormy life, through war, politics, through the study of philosophy and science, and only found in the secret chamber of his heart where his dreams abode under the gentle light of Beatrice's love. This transcendental attitude permeates the whole of the *Commedia*. In it, life is looked at from a distance. It is a meditation on life which results in a tragic indictment of Evil, in the ghastly punishments of Hell, and in a glorification of Good, in the bliss of Paradise. The *Commedia* was written during Dante's exile, and it bears the scars that experience had left in his heart. Dante was a disillusioned and grieving man. Offended by actual life, he sought refuge in an ideal world. Hence, his constant projection toward the past, when beauty and chivalry reigned, his indictment of the present sordid misery and his losing himself in the light and harmonies of Paradise.

Love does not fundamentally change in the *Commedia*. It becomes more human in a Dantesque and universal sense as it is laden with all the weight of the sorrows of the poet's life. Love is more human, not because it acquires any element of passion, but because it is the only solace of the sorrows of a great soul. In many passages Dante discusses love. In the *Purgatorio*, he gives a definition of it which can be summarized thus: love is our bending toward an object of loveliness. Love is

followed step by step from its incipient stage to its highest development. His analysis takes into account, with the accuracy of a modern psychologist, all the elements, bodily as well as spiritual, which create this mysterious power. Love is awakened in us through our senses, but it develops into a spiritual phenomenon, because our desire is a spiritual movement.⁹ Dante's intellectual and universal reaction is never dissociated from the actual experience of life, so that his idealism stands on a concrete basis. We find in this theory the same conception as expressed in the *Vita Nuova*, the love that Dante felt in the pure countenance of Beatrice, in the light of her eyes, in the radiance of her smile. When Dante meets Beatrice on the top of *Purgatory*, she reproaches him for having yielded to passion after her death. Her words rehearse Dante's theory that we have just illustrated.

"Mai non t'appresentò natura od arte
Piacere, quanto le belle membra in ch'io
Rinchiusa fui, e sono in terra sparte;"¹⁰

Body and soul are here presented in a sublime unity, and pleasure is again spiritualized through the pure beauty that shone in Beatrice. The treatment of the concepts of "pleasure" and "beauty" interests us all the more that they appear in the episode of Francesca. It was the "bella persona" of Francesca that revealed love to Paolo's heart, just as Dante came to know love through the "bella membra" of Beatrice. Francesca, in requiting Paolo's love, shared the same "piacere" which gave Dante the joy that consoled and uplifted his heart in the days of his youth as well as during the stormy adventures of his manhood. The parallelism found in the two episodes shows beyond any doubt that Dante attributed to Paolo and Francesca the same kind of love that existed between him and Beatrice.

Francesca is not the only idealised woman in the *Commedia*. Indeed, Dante's poem is a marvelous garden where these flowers of feminine loveliness bloom. Pia, Piccarda, Lia, Matelda, Costanza, Cunizza express the embodiment of the feminine

⁹ *Purgatorio*, XVIII, 19-39.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, XXXI, 49-52.

ideal such as Dante patterned after Beatrice or after his own dream.

Many reasons must have contributed toward Dante's idealization of Francesca. He must have seen and known Paolo during the time that the latter was *capitano del popolo* at Florence in 1282. Paolo is described by all commentators as handsome and given to the gentle cult of art. What more natural than to idealize his love for Francesca of whom Dante describes "la bella persona." Love, according to the code of the *Dolce Stil Nuovo*, had nothing to do with the marriage ties of the lady or man. It was a humble worship that realized its goal in a poetical vent of lofty feelings. How gentle and delicate are the words and thoughts that Dante lends to Francesca! Peace and love hover over the whole episode and they spread a gentle light, a hush of mystic silence over the mysterious search for love that torments man. In that silence every toil, every contradiction disappears, and Dante's mind feels again that peace which Francesca wishes him and which he had experienced in Beatrice's presence; Beatrice, who made everyone chaste and cast a veil of longing melancholy on the soul of man.

At the time that Dante wrote the *Commedia*, the sad happening of the death of Francesca and Paolo belonged already to the past, and the lovers had taken their place for the love poets near Tristan and Iseult. They, too, had made the supreme sacrifice of their lives for love.

Dante's stern moral sense, however, condemned Francesca to Hell because she, being married to Gianciotto, had felt love for Paolo, his brother. No admiration, no affection, no sympathy ever stood in the way of Dante's moral sense. Ulysses, Brunetto Latini, Farinata, Ugolino, are all persons whom Dante admired greatly, but whom he placed, nevertheless, in Hell. He glorified them not for the sin for which they are punished, but for other attributes that he admired in them. As to Francesca, Dante vindicates the nobility of her love for Paolo when she relates to him the story of that love.

Paolo and Francesca are pictured in the episode against a background of courtly life which Gabriele D'Annunzio has reconstructed in his play so magnificently and so perfectly.

They are reading a book of courtly love, the romance of Lancelot. Unknowingly, they feel lost in an atmosphere of love. The simile of doves comes to Dante's mind. As doves glide toward their nest carried by their longing, so Paolo and Francesca answer the call of the poet, who begs them to come to him in the name of the love that gently carries them.

"O anime affannate,
Venite a noi parlar, s'altri nol niega."

No!
(400-40)

Dante forgets altogether the circle, the sinners and the punishments. He addresses them as "anime affannate," referring to "affanni d'amore," and thus using the terminology of love-poetry. It is the love of the *Dolce Stil Nuovo* as we can see from the mention of "cor gentile" and "dolci sospiri," "dolci pensieri," and from the personification of Love; a personification and a terminology which lead us back to the doctrine of love of that school. "It is as natural for a gentle heart to love as for a bird to hasten to the verger," had said Guinizelli, and Dante had clarified that thought in his sonnet:

"Amore e cor gentil sono una cosa."

Benedetto Croce notices the presence of these concepts, but thinks that they are placed there to induce Paolo and Francesca to their sin.¹¹ On the contrary, their presence in the episode shows that, for Dante, Francesca's love for Paolo was a natural movement, natural in a superior order of concepts. Love, which to the songsters of the *Dolce Stil Nuovo* was the supreme power in the universe, echoes in the episode:

"Amor che a cor gentil ratto s'apprende."
"Amor che a nullo amato amar perdona."

If we forget that this conception of love is diffused around Paolo and Francesca, we are easily led astray. G. G. Parodi, another modern critic, sees in Francesca "a woman who loves that way, with all herself and forever," and "what does Francesca know of duty and of wrong? What do excuses matter to her?"¹² He bases his conception of Francesca on

¹¹ Benedetto Croce, *La Poesia di Dante*, 1921, p. 78.

¹² G. G. Parodi, *Poesia e Storia nella Divina Commedia*, 1920, pp. 70, 72.

Dante's line, "Amor ch'a nullo amato amar perdona." Parodi's conception of womanhood does not exist in Dante. What meaning have the words "it is a necessity to requite with love him who loves" severed from the philosophical background that Dante gave to them? To understand the episode, we must imagine it in close and immediate relation with the *Dolce Stil Nuovo*. Dante is simply above the excuses and wrongs in the question. He only thinks of love, and in that name he bids Francesca to tarry and speak to him. Again, how could Dante have spoken to Francesca of a love that reminded her of a sinful relation? While Dante, in the midst of the infernal storm, ponders over their tragedy, he feels in it only a pure and mysterious affinity between two noble and gentle souls. Francesca had discovered love in her heart in response to Paolo's delectation in her. Their love was made of "dolci sospiri," and it prompted them to read together the courtly romance of Lancelot. Dante delicately portrays their love as existing unknown to them. "Soli eravamo e senza alcun sospetto," Francesca tells him, and it is this feeling that makes the poet declare the two lovers innocent and wronged, in no uncertain terms. Dante calls them "anime offense" and bows his head in pity and sympathy, meditating on the beauty of their love. His chief anxiety is to know from Francesca how love was revealed to them:

"Ma dimmi: al tempo de' dolci sospiri,
A che e come concedette Amore
Che conoscesti i dubbiosi desiri?"

One day they were reading together how Lancelot, the gentle and timid lover, was kissed by Guinevere, and Paolo's lips sought hers. This moment of supreme ecstasy was shattered by their death. In the episode, three stages of their love are considered: the "dubbiosi desiri" when love was diffused in their lives without their being conscious of it; the revelation of it through their reading Lancelot's romance; and their tragedy, "il doloroso passo." Love was about to become passion and Dante called on Death to keep that love on the heights that Beatrice had assigned to it. The atmosphere of "fabula" was

about to envelop the two lovers in its prose and he jealously snatched them from it to raise them again to the regions of his lofty poetry where they abide in the luminous beauty of the episode.

Dante's sympathy was so stirred by Francesca's story that he arbitrarily created for the two lovers a vague state that differentiates them from the other sinners. Paolo and Francesca are not violently tossed by the storm like other sinners, but they are gently wafted by their love.

"que due che insieme vanno
E paion sì al vento esser leggieri!"

Their love endures even through eternity and Paolo will never be divided from Francesca. Even the laws of Hell are broken as the storm, that Dante has just said never ceases, subsides around Francesca.

"Mentre che il vento, come fa, si tace."

In the light of this interpretation, Francesca, while condemned by Dante, the moralist, for having loved Paolo, is redeemed by Dante, the poet, for the nobility of her love. It is her innocence that gives a meaning to her resenting the way in which her life was taken. Likewise, it is her innocence that makes her voice echo in the silence and lull of the infernal storm when she cries,

"Caina attende che vita ci spense."

What meaning would these words have on the lips of an adulterous Francesca?

By following this interpretation we can also remove a vulgar meaning from the passage:

"Quel giorno più non vi leggemmo avante"

which is construed by critics to convey a veiled allusion to a tryst between her and Paolo. Could the Francesca we have known in the episode speak in such a manner? Could such a remark from Francesca be followed by the closing lines of the episode?

"Mentre che l'uno spirto questo disse,
L'altro piangeva sì che di pietade
Io venni men così com'io morisse;
E caddi come corpo morto cade."

We interpret those words as a clarification of the "doloroso passo," their death: "We read no further because death claimed us in that very moment."

Furthermore, by considering the episode somewhat isolated from the main narrative, we can account for the fact that the two lovers do not share altogether the lot of the other sinners and for the subsiding of the storm. We can also understand why Caina, the circle of traitors, is waiting for Gianciotto, and, above all, we can see why Dante is so passionately sympathetic with Francesca.

The remembrance of the love that Dante felt for Beatrice had never abandoned him. It shone like a beacon above all his sorrows and disappointments, even to the last years of his life during the bitter days of his exile, when Francesca's countenance smiled on him. The conception of love which he lent to Francesca forms a link between Beatrice and her, between the *Vita Nuova* and the *Divina Commedia*, the first and last chapter of Dante's life.

DOMENICO VITTORINI

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNPUBLISHED FRENCH LETTERS OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

(Continued)

X. MIRABEAU FILS [TO M. DE ROUGEMONT]

The *liaison* of Mirabeau and Sophie de Monnier, the young wife of the septuagenarian marquis de Monnier, began in 1775. On May 10, 1777, the *bailliage* of Pontarlier declared Mirabeau "atteint et convaincu du crime de rapt et de séduction." The lovers were arrested at Amsterdam; Mirabeau was imprisoned in the Donjon de Vincennes, and Mme de Monnier was placed first in the *maison de discipline* of Mlle Douay in Paris, and later in the convent of the Saintes-Claire at Gien.⁷³

Mirabeau's incarceration at Vincennes lasted three and one-half years—from June 7, 1777, to December 13, 1780. Pierre Le Noir, *lieutenant général de police*, allowed the prisoner to correspond with his paramour. Mirabeau's letters were first read by a special police agent named Boucher ("mon bon ange"), and then sent to Mme de Monnier, who was required to return them to the police. In 1792 Pierre Manuel published the letters with the title *Lettres originales de Mirabeau, écrites du Donjon de Vincennes*. . . . Besides the letters to Mme de Monnier, this collection contains a number addressed to other persons—for example, to the comte de Maurepas, M. Le Noir, and M. de Rougemont, governor of the Donjon.

The following letter, written by Mirabeau to M. de Rougemont, was, for some unknown reason, not included in the collection of letters published by Pierre Manuel.

J'ai l'honneur de vous remercier, Monsieur, des livres que vous avez bien voulu m'envoyer.⁷⁴ L'histoire naturelle⁷⁵ est

⁷³ Paul Cottin, *Sophie de Monnier et Mirabeau, d'après leur correspondance secrète inédite (1775-1789)*, Paris, 1903, Introduction.

⁷⁴ During his imprisonment Mirabeau worked feverishly: he translated Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Tibullus, Catullus, Propertius, Tacitus's life of Agricola, parts of Boccaccio's *Decameron*, Tasso's *Aminta*, and the *Basia* of Janus Secundus; he wrote a *Traité de mythologie*, a *Grammaire spéciale*, his celebrated book *Les lettres de cachet* (in which he attacks M. de Rougemont), a drama, a tragedy, two licentious works, etc.

⁷⁵ Probably by Buffon, who is mentioned in a letter written to Mme de Monnier on July 9, 1778.

précisément de l'édition que je la demandois. Quant au Tacite il y a erreur, et c'est ma faute; je croyais que vous acheteriez le recueil de la traduction de la *bleterie*⁷⁶ qui n'a été donnée d'abord que par parties séparées, et j'ai oublié de vous avertir que j'en avois une, précisément celle que vous m'envoyez. Je vous envoie l'une et l'autre; vous verrez que ce sont les mêmes; l'erreur sera facile à réparer, et le libraire ne fera aucune difficulté de reprendre un livre neuf en ayant un autre à fournir. Vous trouverez dans la note ci jointe un détail qui ne laissera aucune obscurité sur ce que je demande. Pardon de cette étourderie; heureusement qu'elle n'est pas grave. Je crois qu'il convient de renvoyer plutôt que plus tard pour que cela ne fasse aucune difficulté.

Je vous prie, Monsieur, de vouloir bien faire donner une décision à la police relativement à M. Fontelliau.⁷⁷ Je n'en parle point à M. Le Noir à qui je demande simplement une lettre de mon amie;⁷⁸ parce que je suis assez grièvement incommodé pour ne pouvoir pas écrire longtems,⁷⁹ et j'ai espéré que vous voudriez bien poursuivre cette affaire qui est purement de votre ressort.

J'ai l'honneur d'être avec des sentimens respectueux, Monsieur, votre très humble et très obeissant serviteur
vingt neuf juillet 1778.

MIRABEAU FILS.⁸⁰

XI. D'ALEMBERT [TO BENJAMIN FRANKLIN?]

This letter was probably addressed to Franklin, who, during his stay in Paris, was frequently called on by Frenchmen of every degree to act as intermediary in matters pertaining to the

⁷⁶ The abbé Jean-Philippe-René de La Bléterie published the following translations of works by Tacitus: *Traduction de quelques ouvrages de Tacite*, Paris, 1755, 2 vol.; *Description de la Germanie et des mœurs de ses habitants*, s. l., 1755; *Tibère, ou les Six premiers livres des Annales*, Paris, 1768, 3 vol.

⁷⁷ Fontelliau was physician of the château de Vincennes and of the convent of the Hospitalières of Saint-Mandé. In a long letter addressed to M. de Rougemont on September 29, 1778 (*Œuvres de Mirabeau*, Paris, 1835, V, 103-113), Mirabeau sets forth his grievances against Fontelliau. A few of his accusations are: drunkenness; neglect of duties at Vincennes in favor of outside patients; gossiping about dissensions among the prison authorities at Vincennes; discussing with Mirabeau M. de Rougemont's unjust treatment of prisoners; and, especially, endeavoring to persuade Mirabeau to lodge complaints with the police against M. de Rougemont.

⁷⁸ Mme de Monnier.

⁷⁹ During the year 1778 Mirabeau suffered from violent nephritic disorders.

⁸⁰ Autograph, Harvard University Library, Sumner 26, II, no. 96. 4 pp., last three pages blank. 8vo.

United States. Both James Parton and Albert Henry Smyth mention d'Alembert among Franklin's acquaintances.⁸¹

Vous avez bien voulu, mon très illustre et très respectable confrère, vous charger de faire parvenir ces lettres à Mr. Danieres, prisonnier en Amérique.⁸² On vous les envoie, pour plus de sûreté, toutes ouvertes, et par duplicata. Son honnête famille vous remercie mille et mille fois. Je joins ma reconnaissance à la sienne, et cette reconnaissance toute grande qu'elle est, est bien au dessous des sentimens de respect, et d'attachement avec lesquels je serai toute ma vie, mon cher et illustre confrère

Votre très humble et
très obéissant serviteur

D'ALEMBERT.⁸³

à Paris ce 25 octobre 1778.

XII. LA HARPE TO PANCKOUCKE

Immediately after Voltaire's death (May 30, 1778), La Harpe, a favorite disciple of the Sage of Ferney, was bitterly assailed by both the friends and the enemies of his master. As a result of the bickering that ensued, La Harpe lost his position as chief editor of the *Mercure de France*, which was then owned by Charles-Joseph Panckoucke. Although La Harpe continued with the *Mercure*, first as theatrical critic and later as a mere contributor,⁸⁴ there is little doubt that the loss of his editorship was the cause of the ill feeling manifested towards Panckoucke in the letter published below.

At the end of 1781 La Harpe seems to have been still disgruntled. After belittling the collaborators on Panckoucke's new edition of the *Encyclopédie*, he adds:

"Le libraire Panckoucke, qui est à la tête de l'entreprise, a choisi tous ceux que lui a désignés M. Suard, son beau-frère; et c'est ainsi que toutes les entreprises littéraires seront conduites, quand il y aura un libraire à la tête." ⁸⁵

⁸¹ Parton, *Life and Times of B. F.*, Boston, 1864, II, 412; Smyth, *The Writings of B. F.*, New York, 1906, VIII, 129. For additional evidence that Franklin and d'Alembert were acquainted, see *Calendar of the Papers of B. F.*, IV, 371.

⁸² I have been unable to find any further information concerning Danières.

⁸³ Autograph, Harvard University Library, Norton 010. 4 pp., last three pages blank. 4to.

⁸⁴ Eugène Hatin, *Histoire . . . de la presse en France*, Paris, 1859, I, 428, note 1.

⁸⁵ *Correspondance littéraire*, second edition, Paris, 1804, III, 302.

A MONSIEUR
MONSIEUR PANCOUKE

11 fevrier [1779?]

Je pourrais trouver un peu extraordinaire que Monsieur Pancouke me croye capable de supposer une promesse qu'il ne m'aurait pas faite, et de la part de tout autre, un pareil manque de mémoire pourrait passer pour une injure, mais avec lui, cette discussion me parait au dessous de moi. Ce qu'il ajoute de l'exemplaire qu'il se propose de donner, *dans le cas du succès* d'une entreprise à laquelle il est publié qu'il n'a pas conservé le moindre titre de propriété, est encore une preuve de son respect pour la vérité, et j'en suis édifié comme du reste. Ce qu'il me convient de faire, c'est de prier Monsieur Pancouke de me renvoyer au plutôt mes 60 lettres originales,⁸⁶ qui, dit il, *ne sont pas sorties de ses mains*, mon intention étant qu'on n'en tire point de copies et qu'on n'en fasse aucun usage. Je me flatte que l'extrême délicatesse de Monsieur Pancouke peut aller jusqu'à ne pas disposer du bien d'autrui. J'ai l'honneur de le saluer très humblement.

DE LA HARPE.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ I am inclined to think that the sixty letters mentioned here were letters written to La Harpe by Voltaire. In 1778, a short time after Voltaire's death, La Harpe wrote in his *Correspondance littéraire* (II, 296):

"Pankoucke vient de commencer la plus grande entreprise de librairie qui se soit faite depuis long-temps; c'est une édition complète des œuvres de Voltaire, augmentée de ses correspondances. . . . Comment se flatter de rassembler toutes les lettres écrites dans le cours d'une si longue vie . . . ? Pankoucke en possède du moins une assez grande partie. M. d'Argental lui a remis toutes celles qu'il avait. . . . Plusieurs gens de lettres ont donné au même libraire celles qu'ils avaient gardées . . . M^{rs} d'Alembert et Condorcet ont donné les leurs; je n'ai pas cru devoir refuser les miennes. . . ."

Pankoucke soon severed his connection with the "grande entreprise de librairie" mentioned above. In February, 1779, he sold to Beaumarchais for 160,000 livres his rights to the edition that appeared later at Kehl (1784-1789). See G. Bengesco, *Voltaire—Bibliographie de ses œuvres*, IV (1890), 110; Fernand Caussy, *Mercur de France*, LXXXIV (1910), 94.

The Moland edition of Voltaire's works contains not exactly sixty, but fifty-five letters addressed by Voltaire to La Harpe.

⁸⁷ Autograph, Boston Public Library, Ch. G. 2. 20. 4 pp.; pages 2 and 3 blank, address on p. 4. 4to.

RICHMOND LAURIN HAWKINS

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

(To be continued)

MISCELLANEOUS

A BRIEF EXAMINATION INTO THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF MARTÍNEZ DE LA ROSA'S *LA CONJURACIÓN DE VENECIA*

IT is inevitable that students of the Romantic Drama in Spain should come into more or less intimate contact with *La conjuración de Venecia*, by Martínez de la Rosa. It is probable, however, that a majority of these students are comparatively unfamiliar with the historical background of the play, or with the degree of accuracy with which historical events are referred to in the work. Menéndez y Pelayo offers the following statement relative to the setting of the play:

"La Venecia del drama es la Venecia un tanto convencional, pero poética é interesante, de puñales y máscaras, de conspiradores y ejecuciones secretas, que habían puesto de moda los románticos, . . . Pero como Martínez de la Rosa todo lo estudiaba bien y se cuidaba mucho de la verdad histórica, no se arrojó á presentar en la escena la conjuración de 1310, de los Querínis y de los Thiépolos, sin haber registrado antes, no sólo la *Historia de Venecia* del Conde Daru, sino los mismos documentos originales, coleccionados por Muratori en el tomo XII de sus *Rerum Italicarum scriptores*, y especialmente las cartas del Dux Gradénigo."¹

In his *advertencia* preceding the play, Martínez de la Rosa himself goes into considerable detail regarding his sources, together with his reasons for writing a dramatic work based upon this particular period in Venetian history.

"De algunos años á esta parte deseaba componer una obra dramática cuyo argumento fuese tomado de la historia de Venecia: la forma de gobierno de aquella república, la severidad de sus leyes, el rigor y el misterio de algunos de sus tribunales, me han parecido siempre muy propios para una composición de esta clase, . . . Al fin me determiné á poner manos á la obra; y ya resuelto á bosquejar una de las revoluciones de aquel Estado, empecé por estudiar detenidamente su historia, valiéndome de la que escribió el conde Daru, . . . Entre los grandes sucesos que presenta, me pareció preferible, por varias razones, la célebre conjuración acaecida en Venecia al comenzar el siglo XIV. . . .

"Da también la casualidad favorable de que no sólo han referido con alguna extensión este suceso los historiadores de Venecia, como Verdizzotti y otros, sino que existen unos documentos auténticos, sumamente preciosos, que dan de esta revolución una cabal idea. Tales son las cartas del mismo dux Gradénigo, escritas en aquellos días á los embajadores de la república y á los gobernadores de las provincias, dándoles cuenta de lo acaecido, en que él había tenido tanta parte; hallándose en la misma obra las sentencias de los reos y muchas circunstancias notables."²

There is appended the following footnote:

"Véase la crónica latina del dux Andrés Dándolo, y su continuación, insertas en el tomo XII, in-folio, de la famosa obra de Muratori: *Rerum italicarum scriptores*."

Since these sources cited by Martínez de la Rosa were not available, the present investigator has been forced to resort to such secondary sources as were accessible.

The explanatory subtitle, *año de 1310*, fixes the date of the supposed events

¹ Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, *Estudios de crítica literaria*, 1^{ra} serie (2da ed.), t. I, Madrid, 1893, pp. 273-274.

² *Obras dramáticas de D. F. Martínez de la Rosa*, t. II, Madrid, 1861, pp. 309-310.

which form the nucleus of *La conjuración de Venecia*. The conspiracy of 1310 is, of course, authentic; but the reader must be on guard against minor anachronisms throughout the play, for there is the possibility that the author may invoke his creative license to the extent of modifying the historical framework to fit the dramatic requirements of the stage. This modification takes place, to a certain extent, but Martínez de la Rosa has been more conscientious in this respect than have the authors of a great number of pseudo-historical works.

Several persons in the cast of characters may be identified as actually having figured in Venetian history. The brothers Querini—Marco, Jacopo (Marcos and Jacobo in the play), and Pietro (not mentioned in the play)—were members of the old Venetian nobility which had expressed discontent with the Doge and his party on a number of previous occasions. Jacopo had recently been appointed Ambassador to Constantinople, and he took no actual part in the rebellion. Boemundo Thiépolo is Bajamonte Tiepolo, a descendant of former doges, and the son-in-law of Marco Querini. Tiepolo was called *il gran cavaliere* (the Great Cavalier) by the people, and his popularity with the masses was reckoned a great asset to the conspiracy. Badoer Badoer was of a family politically prominent in the Paduan suburb of Peraga, and it was at his own suggestion that Badoer was entrusted with the raising of troops in this vicinity to support the conspiracy.³ Andrés Dauro is obviously Andrea Doro, a Privy Councillor who had been won over to the cause of the conspirators.⁴ The two brothers Morosini, Juan and Pedro, are probably the author's creations, although the Morosini family was of some distinction in Venice and it is possible that two members of this house may have borne these baptismal names.

Rugiero, the hero of the play and the long-lost son of Pedro Morosini, may be historical, for mention is made of a Ruggiero Morosini who in 1296 was in command of a Venetian fleet that attacked Constantinople.⁵ A plausible and quite probable explanation, however, would be that Martínez de la Rosa may have encountered the name of this Ruggiero while engaged in his historical researches and simply have bestowed it upon his hero, since the Morosini were to take such important rôles in the play. The mere use of an additional name of historical authenticity, in a play presumably historical, may have offered a suggestion of greater verisimilitude of which the dramatist was not slow to avail himself. The remaining characters of the play are either the author's own creations or else persons of little or no historical importance; hence they may be passed over without further comment.

A slight anachronism is indicated in the cast of characters, in which Pedro Morosini is given the office of "presidente primero del Tribunal de los Diez." This "Tribunal de los Diez," very obviously the Council of Ten, did not come into existence until after the rebellion had been crushed. The need for such a body was made apparent by the conspiracy of 1310, of which the Council of Ten may be said to have been a direct result. The revolt broke out on June 15, 1310, and the Council of Ten was created as a committee of public safety on July 10th of the same year. Designed at first to function only until Michaelmas, the Council soon became an integral part of the governmental machinery. After various extensions of time

³ W. Carew Hazlitt, *History of the Venetian Republic: Her Rise, Her Greatness, and Her Civilization*, 4 vols., London, 1860; Vol. III, p. 2.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 458.

⁵ Horatio F. Brown, *Venice, an Historical Sketch of the Republic*, London, 1893, p. 160.

had prolonged its existence, the Council of Ten was finally declared permanent in 1335.⁶

An adequate treatment of the various underlying causes of the conspiracy is impossible within the confines of this paper. The struggle between the old and the new orders of the aristocracy for the control of the Venetian government was growing more bitter and personal. Pietro Gradenigo, Doge from 1289 to 1311, represented the new aristocracy which sought to bring the control of the Republic into the hands of an oligarchy composed of members of the new order. A rupture was imminent when Doimo, Count of Veglia, was chosen to fill a seat in the ducal council in preference to Marco Querini, a member of the old aristocracy. Doimo's election was immediately claimed illegal by the party of Querini, since by law Dalmatians were excluded from all governmental positions except the *Maggior Consiglio* (the Great Council) and the Senate. Street fighting became so frequent that citizens were forbidden to carry arms, and the *Signori di Notte*, as heads of the police patrol, were ordered to enforce this edict. Marco Morosini, one of these "Lords of the Night" and an adherent of the Gradenigo faction, on one occasion endeavored to search Pietro Querini, the brother of Marco Querini, for concealed weapons. Pietro kicked Morosini in the stomach, knocking him down, and was fined for his resistance. Marco Querini resolved to act at once, and he called a meeting of various prominent nobles known to be in opposition to the Doge.⁷ Bajamonte Tiepolo, whose popularity with the common people caused his aid to be considered a valuable asset to any projected conspiracy against the party in power, was not in Venice at the time; but it was decided to hold a second meeting to which he should be invited.

And now we approach the opening act of the play. This second meeting was held in the Querini palace (in the play it is represented as taking place in the palace of the Genoese Ambassador), and the grievances against the Doge and his faction were freely discussed. Among these grievances was the closing of the Great Council to all but a very small group of the nobility, a political stroke accomplished by the party of the Doge in 1297.⁸ It is probable that the disastrous naval battle of Curzola and the loss of "Tolemaida" (probably Ptolemais), mentioned by Badoer in the play (Act I, Scene III), likewise called forth comment. The battle of Curzola, fought between the Venetians and the Genoese in 1298, had resulted in the almost total destruction of the Venetian fleet.⁹ Ptolemais (better known as St. Jean d'Acre) had long been regarded as the "Key of Palestine," and its loss to the Mussulmans in 1291 was a severe blow to the Eastern trade of Venice.¹⁰

A more recent calamity was the outcome of the struggle with the Papacy for the overlordship of Ferrara, resulting in a bull of excommunication and interdict issued by Pope Clement V, March 27, 1309, directed against the Venetian Republic, her Doge, councils, generals, and all those who had offered opposition to the Papal control of Ferrara.¹¹ It is to this misfortune that Mafei alludes (Act I, Scene III) when he says: "Su (referring to the Pope) tremendo entredicho pesa sobre nosotros; y á su voz todas las naciones nos repulsan como apestados, . . ." The "derrota del Po" cited by Badoer in the preceding speech possibly refers to an incident during the struggle for Ferrara.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 176-177.

⁷ Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

⁸ Brown, *op. cit.*, pp. 162-164.

⁹ Alethea Wiel, *The Navy of Venice*, London, 1910, pp. 182-183.

¹⁰ Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 159.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 168-172.

Jacopo Querini opposed the use of violence against the Doge and his party, but on Jacopo's departure for Constantinople a final meeting was held and the details of the revolt were worked out. The attack on the governmental party was set for June 15th, and the conspirators were to gather at the Querini palace the night before. At dawn they were to start for the Piazza of St. Mark in two divisions, one of which was to be led by Marco Querini and the other by Tiepolo. The object was to seize the ducal palace, kill or capture the Doge and his chief supporters, and thus break the backbone of the resistance at one stroke. Badoer was sent to the mainland to take command of the troops previously enlisted from the vicinity of Padua. On the appointed day he was supposed to arrive with his forces by water, seize the Grand Canal, and unite with the other conspirators in the Piazza.

But it is necessary to return to the play in order to see to what extent it coincides with history. Acts II and III, although of great dramatic interest, may be passed over as having no direct historical relation to the outcome of the conspiracy. Act IV, in which the actual outbreak occurs, is effective from a dramatic viewpoint but contributes little or no reliable historical information. The idea of having the disguised conspirators mingle with the merry-makers while awaiting the signal for the attack is a good dramatic device, but it is historically inaccurate. The author is guilty of a rather serious anachronism (Act IV, Scene IV) when he makes the *Comandante* of the guard refer to the "Bridge of Sighs" as an exit from the ducal palace. This bridge, which connects the state prisons and the ducal palace, was constructed between 1595 and 1605, almost three hundred years later than the date of the Tiepoline rebellion.

The conspirators were confident of surprising the Doge by their attack, but this expectation was not to be realized. Marco Donato, who had joined the conspirators and thus become acquainted with their plans, secretly changed sides and betrayed the details of the carefully laid plot to the Doge the very afternoon before the scheduled attack of the morrow. The Doge acted with the vigorous promptness demanded by the occasion. He armed his own immediate followers, commanded the faithful nobles to arm themselves and their servants, called upon the citizens of the vicinity of St. Mark's to hasten to the Piazza for the purpose of defending the Republic, and he dispatched messengers to Chioggia, Murano, Burano, and Torcello, demanding reinforcements.

The conspirators, still counting the element of surprise in their favor, were delayed by a severe storm that broke just as they were preparing to start their march to the Piazza early on the morning of June 15th. The forces of Tiepolo and those of Marco Querini were led by different routes through the city, and it was Querini's misfortune to arrive first at the Piazza of St. Mark. Here he found the forces of the Doge ready and waiting, and in the surprise of the ensuing struggle Marco Querini was killed and his troops were quickly put to flight. Thus, when Bajamonte arrived he found the party of the Doge in full possession of the Piazza. Although surprised, Tiepolo offered battle at once, but his troops were soon routed and forced to flee beyond the Rialto. The Paduan contingent, led by Badoer, was met and defeated shortly thereafter on the lagoon by the reinforcements secured by the Doge from Chioggia. Badoer was captured, together with a number of his followers.

Thus the entire scheme of the conspirators had miscarried, and it merely remained for the Doge to punish the leaders of the insurrection. Querini had been killed; Badoer had been made prisoner, and his execution was but a question of time; Tiepolo, however, offered a more serious problem. He had covered his retreat by

cutting down the wooden Rialto bridge, and he and his surviving followers had strongly fortified themselves in the Querini houses beyond the canal. The Doge, uncertain of his own strength and possibly desirous of avoiding the public indignation certain to be aroused should a man of Tiepolo's popularity be executed, offered generous terms for Bajamonte's capitulation. Tiepolo and his chief aides were banished for life from Venice, a number of less influential patricians were exiled for shorter periods, and the more humble of Bajamonte's followers were pardoned. Badoer was shortly tried, sentenced and beheaded for his part in the conspiracy—a fate shared by a number of his Paduan confederates. During his exile Tiepolo made several attempts to stir up trouble for the Doge and his party, but the rebellion had been too successfully extinguished to be revived. The conspiracy of 1310 had resulted in strengthening the power of the new aristocracy, rather than in destroying it. The people, depended upon to aid the conspirators, had supported the Doge; and thus the oligarchy had received, outwardly at least, the confirmation of the Venetian populace.¹²

Act V of the play represents the trial of Rugiero before the dread Council of Ten; hence it may be well to briefly examine the composition and methods of procedure of this body—bearing in mind that the Council was actually created *after* the rebellion, as has been indicated, although a somewhat analogous Council or Committee of Ten enjoying far less power may have existed before the year 1310.¹³ The Council created in 1310 actually consisted of seventeen members when constituting a court. Ten members were chosen from the Great Council to serve for a period of one year. With these ten men sat the Doge and six ducal councilors, and twelve of these seventeen members were necessary to constitute a quorum. Each month the Council chose three *Capi*, or chiefs, to whom the execution of its decisions was entrusted. The "three presidents" of the play are evidently meant to represent these *Capi*. A State Advocate (*Avogador di Comun*) was also present to inform the Council on points of law and legal procedure, but he had no vote. Later, twenty members chosen in the Great Council were customarily added to the Council of Ten when important cases were to be tried. The meetings of the Council were held in a room of the ducal palace and were presided over by the Doge. The Doge, it will be remembered, does not figure in the trial of Rugiero in the play.

The Council's method of conducting trials is very well brought out by the dramatist. The prisoner was considered guilty until his innocence was proved, and he had to conduct his own defense. He was permitted to see neither his accusers nor the witnesses in the case, and prisoner and witnesses might be put to the torture when such a method of securing evidence was deemed advisable by the Council. An elaborate system of espionage was maintained, as Pedro Morosini's conversation with the two spies reveals (Act II, Scene I). Among the types of punishment inflicted by the Council were fines, banishment or outlawry, imprisonment, sentences to serve in the galleys, and mutilation. The extreme penalty included death by beheading, strangulation, and drowning; and these executions might be either public

¹² Chief sources consulted for details of the conspiracy of 1310: Brown, *op. cit.*, pp. 173-176; Horatio F. Brown, *Studies in the History of Venice*, Vol. I, London, 1907, pp. 68-76; Hazlitt, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 458-464; Vol. III, pp. 1-19; George B. McClellan, *The Oligarchy of Venice, an Essay*, Cambridge, Mass., 1904, pp. 92-97; William Roscoe Thayer, *A Short History of Venice*, Cambridge, Mass., 1905, pp. 112-115.

¹³ Brown, *Studies in the History of Venice*, Vol. I, footnote to p. 77.

or secret, at the discretion of the Council. The cord and pulley, and exposure of the victim's bare feet to fire were two modes of torture frequently employed.¹⁴

Martínez de la Rosa evidently made a rather intensive study of the Council of Ten and its judicial functions, and he endeavors to follow in some detail the customary procedure of this body. Evidence of this attention to detail is found in Pedro Morosini's reply to the insults of Mafei (Act V, Scene IV). "El tribunal juzga sin pasión y sin ira: ni las súplicas le ablandan, ni los insultos le exasperan," Morosini declares. As a matter of fact, the prosecutors were expressly forbidden to cross-examine in anger.¹⁵ The statement of the secretary (Act V, Scene VIII) that Rugiero has been removed to "los pozos" is another case in point, since the *Pozzi* (Wells) was the name generally used to refer to the prisons located in the cellar of the ducal palace.¹⁶

Finally, with due allowances for discrepancies and an occasional anachronism, it must be admitted that Martínez de la Rosa has handled his setting very effectively from a dramatic standpoint; and *La conjuración de Venecia* is certainly not inferior in point of historical accuracy to many plays, both of earlier and of later date, whose backgrounds are presumably historical. Plays with historical settings invariably present difficulties, and an occasional slight deviation from strict historical accuracy of detail may be pardoned the dramatist, especially when such minor changes serve to heighten the dramatic interest.

ROBERT AVRETT

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS,

COLLEGE OF MINES AND METALLURGY, EL PASO, TEXAS

TWO NOTES ON *LES CENCI* OF STENDHAL

FOLLOWING the bibliography of *Les Cenci* in the 1921 edition of Stendhal's *Chroniques Italiennes*, in which the works on the same subject antedating Stendhal's are: "P. B. Shelley. The Cenci, a tragedy in five acts, Italy, 1819," and "A. de Malartic. *Relation de la Mort de Giacomo et de Béatrice Cenci et de Lucrece Pétroni*, Paris, 1828," the editor says:¹ "Il serait curieux de savoir ce que Stendhal doit à Shelley et à l'édition de 1828 comme inspiration; d'autre part, la confrontation de son texte avec les études postérieures pourrait servir à établir le sens critique de Beyle et sa puissance d'affabulation." One might expect an *édition documentaire* to satisfy these curiosities but it does not.

The reading of Shelley's tragedy and of Stendhal's story is sufficient to convince one that from a literary standpoint Stendhal owes nothing to Shelley. The works are incomparable, Shelley's being a work of art. Still, Stendhal's is not a mere rehash of an old *relazione* as Crawford² would have us believe. His eleven page preface on the Don Juans of literature and his three page description of the portraits in the Barberini palace as well as his interpolations^{3a} in the text make his *Cenci*

¹⁴ Brown, *Venice, an Historical Sketch of the Republic*, pp. 177-180.

¹⁵ Thayer, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 220.

¹ René-Louis Doyon, t. I, p. 103.

² *The Century Magazine*, v. 75 old series, Jan. 1898.

^{3a} Twice he interrupts his translation, explaining in parentheses the reason for so doing, the first time, however, omitting practically nothing, the second time, about half a page. None of his interpolations alter the current of events.

something superior to what might be inferred from Crawford's words or even to a mere translation as Stendhal himself calls it.

His only indebtedness to Shelley could be in borrowing Shelley's inventions. Crawford says: "It is Shelley's invention that the Turbantina was a portrait of Beatrice by Guido Reni." Nevertheless, this is doubtful. It seems more probable that this opinion was common property when Shelley wrote, "I had a copy of Guido's picture of Beatrice which is preserved in the Colonna palace," he says⁴ in his preface, "and my servant instantly recognized it as the portrait of La Cenci." Max von Boehn in his volume of 1910 on Guido Reni⁵ makes no mention of Shelley in his discussion of the Turbantina legend. He attributes the invention to the zeal for tips of a custodian of the Barberini gallery, catering to the romantic fervor of the early nineteenth century, familiar in Italy with the Cenci story from its circulation in manuscript. Corrado Ricci in his monumental work⁶ on the Cenci says that he had examined some fifty of these manuscripts. It is to be noted likewise that Stendhal finds the portrait in the Barberini palace where it is regularly reported to be, while Shelley says it was in the Colonna palace. Crawford⁷ attributes to Stendhal the assertion that he "had been in love with Beatrice's famous portrait for thirty years." What Stendhal did say⁸ was that he had gone to see the portrait in 1823 and was charmed by it. Crawford refers to the 1855 edition of the *Chroniques Italiennes*, apparently being unaware that *Les Cenci* had been already published in 1837 in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* and that Stendhal had died in 1842.

The other invention attributed to Shelley, the banquet scene,⁹ that "fantasia tanto sbrigliata quanto feroce," as Rinieri calls it,¹⁰ was certainly not appropriated by Stendhal. He simply says,¹¹ following the old chronicle, that the father on the death of his sons "ne voulait pas dépenser une bafce pour des cierges," "neppure in lume volle spendere un bajocco," and that he would be happy only when all his children were buried and when the last happened to die he wanted to set fire to his palace as a sign of his happiness.

Stendhal had had plenty of opportunity to become acquainted with Shelley's work before he published his own. An edition of Shelley's poetical works, including his *Cenci* but without his translation of the *relazione* he used, had been published in Paris in 1829.¹² There is even a bit of evidence that might indicate that Stendhal was familiar with Shelley. Paul Hazard in his *Vie de Stendhal*¹³ cites Stendhal's

¹ *O.c.*, p. 458.

⁴ Ed. Ingpen and Beck, v. 2, p. 73.

⁵ P. 36. "Das Bild ist erst im neunzehnten Jahrhundert aufgetaucht; nachdem die Literatur sich des Stoffes bemächtigt und ihn nach dem Bedürfnis der Romantik zurechtgemodelt hatte, da hat ein findiger Custode dem Gemälde durch die geschickte Taufe ein lebhaftes Interesse und sich der Rührung entsprechende Trinkgelder gesichert."

⁶ Milan, 1923, 2 vols., 658 pp.; v. II, p. 195.

⁷ *O.c.*, p. 462.

⁸ *O.c.*, p. 115.

⁹ Crawford, *o.c.*, p. 461.

¹⁰ P. J. Rinieri, *Beatrice Cenci*, Siena, 1909, p. 2.

¹¹ *O.c.*, p. 127.

¹² The Philadelphia reprint of this edition in the library of the Wisconsin State Historical Society bears the date 1832, not 1831 as Woodberry gives it in his edition of the *Cenci* of Shelley, p. 152.

¹³ Ed. 1927, p. 139.

writing in 1832: "Je ne respirais qu'en soupirant (Shelley)." Stendhal may also have met Shelley in Italy although we cannot believe that it was in 1816 as he says because at that time Shelley was in England.¹⁴

Nevertheless, we find no indication that Stendhal in his *Cenci* owes anything to Shelley. If, as Rinieri says,¹⁵ Stendhal "riproduce il concetto dello Shelley," it is only true in so far as Shelley followed the old story on which his tragedy was based.

As for what Stendhal owes Malartic it must first be noted that M. Doyon's date for Malartic's version of the *Cenci* story is 1828, the same date as that given by Rémy de Gourmont in his article on the *Cenci* in the *Grande Encyclopédie* and by Rinieri.¹⁶ Newberry in his note on the sources of the *Cenci* refers¹⁷ to Crawford's mentioning "an Italian account of the trial and execution, which he describes as "based on the *relazioni*" and published in London, 1821; and he adds that a copy of "the relation" itself was first printed in Paris, 1822, by F. d'Urbain in the *Bibliothèque de la Société des Bibliographes*, and was translated into French by Alphonse de Malartic." When I was in London the summer of 1928, I found at the British museum the publications to which reference is here made. The date of Malartic's work as given by Crawford and Woodberry is indeed 1822, not 1823 as given by Cordier,¹⁸ nor 1828 as given by Rinieri, Rémy de Gourmont and M. Doyon. But "the Italian account of the trial, . . . based on the *relazioni* and published in London, 1821," is itself simply a *relazione*. It bears on its title page "Londra da' Torchii di J. Moyes, Greville St. 1821" and, curiously enough, is bound with a copy of the second edition of Shelley's tragedy, published by C. & J. Ollier, and not Shelley's original *relazione* or his translation of it as one might have expected. Malartic's translation followed by his Italian original is found in a big volume of *Mélanges* published by Didot for the *Société de Bibliophiles français*, not *Bibliographes*.

A comparison of the two Italian accounts in the British Museum and the Shelley translation shows that Stendhal's *relazione* follows more closely that of London 1821 than Malartic's or Shelley's. Stendhal's translation contains, toward the close, a paragraph¹⁹ that does not appear in Shelley's or Malartic's but which does appear with variations in the Italian of 1821.

"Le soleil avait été si ardent, que plusieurs des spectateurs de cette tragédie moururent dans la nuit, et parmi eux Ubaldino Ubaldini, jeune homme d'une rare beauté et qui jouissait auparavant d'une parfaite santé. Il était le frère du signor Renzi, si connu dans Rome. Ainsi les ombres des *Cenci* s'en allèrent bien accompagnées." "Tra le molte migliaia di persone, che si trovarono alla morte di questi miseri, molti non aspettarono il giorno presente che morirono di scanzanza (sic); tra gli altri morì il Signor Ubaldino Ubaldini, giovine di 35 anni, benissimo disposto, fratello della Renza, tanto nominata in Roma, per le sue rare bellezze maritata ad un fratello di mon signore Bendi."

In Malartic's *relazione*, the brothers are sent to school to Salerno; in that of 1821, as in Shelley's, to Salamanca. In Malartic's, one of the brothers was assassinated by a Dorcino; in that of 1821 by a Norcino. Stendhal did not have the critical sense to divine here an *Orsino*, one of the family of the Orsini, and translated a *charcutier*,²⁰

¹⁴ Doris Gunnel, *Stendhal et L'Angleterre*, pp. 45-46; P. Trompeo, *Nell' Italia romantica sulle orme di Stendhal*, Roma, 1924, p. 257.

¹⁵ *O.c.*, p. 17.

¹⁶ *O.c.*, p. 5.

¹⁷ "The *Cenci*," p. 130.

¹⁸ *Bibliographie Stendhalienne*, 1914, p. 167.

¹⁹ *O.c.*, p. 157.

²⁰ *O.c.*, p. 126.

the inhabitants of the commune of Norcia being renowned for its pork butchers. Since a quack surgeon may be dubbed in French a *charcutier*, and in Italian a *norcino* Shelley, who had before him in this particular a text like Stendhal's, was a shade less accurate in translating *Norcino* unqualifiedly "surgeon." Stendhal has the prisoners given to prepare their defense "un sursis de 25 jours,"²¹ as in the 1821 *relazione*, and as in Shelley; Malartic, "tre giorni di tempo per le loro difese." Stendhal's description of Beatrice²² resembles much more that in the 1821 version than Malartic's or Shelley's:

"Béatrix Cenci, qui inspirera des regrets éternels, avait justement seize ans; elle était petite; elle avait un joli embonpoint et des fossettes au milieu des joues, de façon que, morte et couronnée de fleurs, on eût dit qu'elle dormait et même qu'elle riait, comme il lui arrivait fort souvent quand elle était en vie. Elle avait la bouche petite, les cheveux blonds et naturellement bouclés. En allant à la mort, ces cheveux blonds et bouclés lui retombaient sur les yeux, ce qui donnait une certaine grâce et portait à la compassion." "La Signora Beatrice era dell'età di anni 26, piccola e ritondetta, con bellissima faccia, con occhi piccoli, naso profilato e guancie tonde con le fossette, con petto giusto, di maniera che morta pareva ancora che ridesse come in vita; aveva similmente al mento una fossetta proporzionata, e bella bocca, capigliatura bionda e crespa, e inanellata, onde andando alla Giustizia li cadevano giù l'anellature dei capelli che li davano una grazia non ordinaria." Malartic's original reads: "La signora Beatrice era di statura giusta (*grande* in his translation), ben formata, ed in tutte le sue parti bellissima, ma quel che è più, di spirito elevatissimo, di carnagione bianca, ed aveva anche ella bellissima faccia, e capelli castagni chiari, ma ricci, con occhi neri e vivaci che più le davano bellezza, leggiadria, non passava l'età di anni ventidue circa, nei quali ella per sua cattiva sorte e disgrazia fece di se un non degno spettacolo alla sua patria."

The dimples are transferred in Malartic's version to the step-mother, *Lucrezia Petroni*—"guancie rotonde con la fossetta dimodochè da morta ancora pareva ridesse, come in vita." Again, Malartic's manuscript reads that the Pope, suspecting that the first judge to whom the case was committed, was affected by Beatrice's beauty,

"gli levò la causa delle mani con commetterla ad altri, facendole tormentare il bel corpo e farla rasare e poi fece venire avanti la matregna ed i fratelli, mentre stava legata alla corda."

Naturally if her head had been shaved, she had no curls to grace her on the way to the execution. In the version of 1821 she had only been threatened with being shaved, the second judge "volse prima farli venire avanti la matregna ed i fratelli, mentre stava legata alla corda." Shelley at this point translates:²³ "The pope committed the cause to another, who found out another mode of torment called the torture of the hair and when she was already tied under this torture he brought her before her mother-in-law and brothers." He had evidently in his text the same words as in Stendhal's *ad torturam capillorum*²⁴ which Stendhal explains in parentheses, "c'est-à-dire qu'on donna la question à Béatrix Cenci en la suspendant par les cheveux." Yet he still says what Shelley omits: "En allant à la mort, ces cheveux blonds et bouclés lui retombaient sur les yeux."

It will be noticed above that Malartic's version is historically accurate in making Beatrice twenty-two years old when she died. Shelley makes her twenty. But Stendhal's version is not the only one that says she was sixteen. A *relazione* published

²¹ *O.c.*, p. 142.

²² *O.c.*, p. 136.

²³ *O.c.*, p. 139.

²⁴ *O.c.*, p. 140.

in Paris in 1825 also makes her sixteen. Rinieri claims²⁶ that it was from this *relazione* that

"lo Stendhal, poi quasi tutti i seguenti publicatori di storie e di novelle sulla famiglia de' Cenci—tutti attinsero le loro notizie alla detta Relazione."

The question has even been raised whether this Paris (1825) *relazione* was the work of Stendhal and from outside evidence rather hesitatingly decided in the negative.²⁶ But the content of this Paris print precludes at any rate its being the same *Relazione* that Stendhal used for his *Chronique italienne* of 1837 in spite of its agreement with him here on the age of the heroine. The older daughter, for example, who is nameless in Stendhal, is called in the 1825 version Olimpia and is represented also as a victim of her father's vice.

The above details are sufficient to show that Stendhal owed nothing to Malartic and that it was not Shelley's version that he had. The fate of these manuscripts of the story furnishes a lesson to editors of old French texts which have come down to us in more than one form. Although Adolphe Paupe says²⁷ that Stendhal was never deceived (*jamais dupe*), he was at least once in considering²⁸ his *relazione* of the Cenci an historically accurate document, written the day after the execution recounted. This fact granted, much of the criticism of his *Cenci* is wide of the mark. M. Geffroy, for example, reviewing the second edition of Bertoletti's work, says:²⁹

"Quant aux âges, le récit prétendu contemporain que Stendhal a traduit en l'altérant comme il n'est pas permis de faire pour un document qu'on donne comme historique, est postérieur de près d'un siècle: il prête à Béatrice 16 ans en même temps qu'il ôte vingt années au père dans une intention trop facile à comprendre."

This last statement is wrong, and Crawford is right in fact when eighteen years later he complains that Stendhal made the additional mistake of making Francesco born in 1527 instead of 1549, but both seem to fail to appreciate that he is but following his Italian account of the story.

This seems to be the case likewise with M. Doyon when he raises the question of Stendhal's indebtedness to Malartic, or of the critical sense or power of affabulation which Stendhal shows in the *Cenci*. To be sure he must be credited with not tampering with his old story as some of his successors have done. At the British Museum, I examined a copy in English of the seventh edition of a History of Beatrice Cenci by Amedeo Barbiellini Amidei³⁰ in which we read:

"It was then the turn of the beautiful Beatrice. Pale, with her lovely fair hair, and dressed in white, she looked like an angel, a sad but beautiful angel. She ascended the scaffold, firmly knelt down and with eyes turned heavenward cried out: 'My God, I die innocent.'"

LUCY M. GAY

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

²⁶ *O.c.*, p. 47.

²⁷ H. Cordier, *Bibliothèque Stendhalienne*, 1914, p. 168; Doyon, *o.c.*, p. 102.

²⁸ *La Vie littéraire de Stendhal*, p. 161.

²⁹ *O.c.*, p. 118.

³⁰ *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1880, t. 38, p. 943.

³¹ Roma, 1909, p. 34.

THE SECOND PERSON PLURAL IN PORTUGUESE

WITH the exception of the perf. ind., all Latin tenses¹ that have been preserved in Portuguese present in the ending of the 2d plu. an intervocalic *i*, which became *d* in early Portuguese, and was preserved for several centuries.

While the classical Latin prototypes of the 2d plu. of the cond., imperf. ind., pluperf. ind. and imperf. subj. were paroxytones, they became proparoxytones in Portuguese by analogy with the whole singular and 3d plu., in which the accent falls on the syllable immediately following the verb-stem.² The fut. subj. comes from a form that was originally a proparoxytone. Of these five tenses having proparoxytonic forms, the cond., imperf. ind., pluperf. ind., and imperf. subj. preserved their penults.³ The fut. subj. alone dropped its penult, producing a new paroxytone in which the *d* was no longer intervocalic and therefore was retained. In the other eight tenses the *d* became silent.⁴ Final unaccented *e*, now in hiatus, became *i*,⁵ although it persisted orthographically as *e* for a long time, especially after *a*.

At a much earlier period in the history of the language, an *i* in hiatus with a preceding *a* changed the *a* to *e*.⁶ This is exemplified in the 1st sing. of the perf. of the first conjugation: *amāi* > *amei*. With the *d* silent, one might expect the same development in the 2d plu. pres. ind. and pres. impv. of the 1st conjugation and pres. subj. of the 2d and 3d conjugations, from the combination of accented *a* plus *i*, as well as in the 2d plu. imperf. ind., pluperf. ind. and cond. of all conjugations, from the combination of unaccented *a* plus *i*. But, although the activity of this phenomenon probably extended over several centuries,⁷ it had by the time *d* dropped lost much of its force. Accented *a* plus *i* remained unchanged. However, unaccented *a* (which had weakened in general to obscure *e*) plus *i* changed to *e*.⁸ Thus

¹ This includes, of course, the forms *habētis* and *habebātis*, which developed into the endings for the Portuguese fut. ind. and cond.

² Cf. Zauner, *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft*, I, p. 145.

³ The penult of proparoxytones drops except when it is *a* or when it is preceded by a group of consonants; cf. Zauner, *op. cit.*, I, p. 77, § 402. In the 2d plu. of the imperf. subj. in Italian, *ss* was simplified to *s* and the penult dropped. Thus a form developed which is the same as the perf. It was probably to avoid this ambiguity that the simplification of the consonant group and the resultant syncope did not take place in Portuguese.

⁴ This *d* is still retained in many Portuguese dialects; hence many such forms in Gil Vicente; cf. Leite de Vasconcellos, *Lições de Filologia Portuguesa*, 2d ed., Lisbon, 1926, p. 187.

⁵ Cf. J. J. Nunes, *Compêndio de Gramática Histórica Portuguesa*, Lisbon, 1919, p. 69, Obs. III, 3. Cf. Menéndez Pidal, *Manual*, 5th ed., Madrid, 1925, § 282. For the sound represented by this symbol, see T. Navarro Tomás, *Manual de pronunciación española*, Madrid, 1921, § 47.

⁶ J. J. Nunes, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

⁷ Cf. Menéndez Pidal, *Orígenes del español*, Madrid, 1926, § 183.

⁸ In these forms in Spanish, unaccented *a* remained unchanged because in the proparoxytonic forms *d* dropped much later than in the paroxytonic forms, and in all forms much later than in Portuguese; cf. R. J. Cuervo, *Las segundas personas de plural en la conjugación castellana*, in *Romania*, XXII, p. 74 ss. Furthermore, unaccented *a* probably never became so obscure and therefore, so unstable as in Portuguese; compare Sp. *arraigar* and Port. *arreigar*, Sp. *traidor* and Old Port. *treidor*.

the stages through which, for example, the imperf. ind. of the 1st conjugation passed, are as follows: *-ávades* > *-ávaes* > [aveis] > *-ávees*, which is now spelled *-áveis*. It is curious that no such form as *-ávaes* is found, although it is a necessary step in the development, and corresponds to the Spanish form. For example, in a document⁹ of the early fifteenth century containing both forms with *d* and forms without *d*, we find the following examples of the tenses in question:

Imperf. Ind.			
deuiades (p. 66)		andauees (p. 23)	
auiaades (p. 68)		faziees (p. 24)	
traziades (p. 134)		percebiees (p. 68)	
		erees (p. 68)	
		partiees (p. 92)	
		tardauees (p. 137)	
		amauees (p. 171)	
Pluperf. Ind.		Cond.	
amarades (p. 171)	tardarees (p. 137)	deueriades (p. 185)	leuariiees (p. 68)
	acharees (p. 137)		
	derees (p. 171)		

Old and new forms stand side by side, the words of the same speaker, as *auiaades*, *percebiees*, *erees*, and *amarades*, *derees*. But the intermediate stage is missing. There can be only one explanation for this, namely, that *d* became silent long before it dropped in spelling, and that scribes became conscious of the discrepancy between pronunciation and orthography with regard to both phenomena (i.e. the silence of the *d* and the consequent change of *a* to *e*) at the same time. It is therefore quite likely that the writer of the old forms, quoted above, pronounced them wholly in the new way.¹⁰

There are a few verbs in modern Portuguese which still display a *d* in one or two forms. In *tendes*, *vindes*, *pondes* (pres. ind.), and *tende*, *vinde*, *ponde* (pres. impv.), *d* ceased to be intervocalic because of the juxtaposition of *n* which had moved forward by progressive nasalization.¹¹ In *credes*, *rides*, *vêdes*, *crede*, *ride*, *vêde*, *sêde* and *vades*, *d* was obviously strengthened by reminiscence of the preceding *d* of the Latin stem. *Ledes*, *lede* developed by analogy with *credes*, *crede*, while the retention of *d* in *ides*, *ide* preserved their very identity.

Contrary to the opinion of Adolfo Coelho¹² and Reinhardtstoettner¹³ that the

⁹ *Chronica do condestabre de Portugal Dom Nuno Alvarez Pereira*, edited by Mendes dos Remedios, Coimbra, 1911 (vol. XIV of *Subsídios para o estudo da História da Literatura Portuguesa*).

¹⁰ The *Chronica do condestabre* contains about one hundred 2d plu. forms, of which about twenty are forms with *d*. As the chronicler was probably an intimate of the hero, and as all of our examples are taken from quotations, it is likely that he actually heard the words he reports. At times he remembered their very forms (i.e. with *d*), while at other times he yielded to current usage (without *d*).

¹¹ For a discussion of progressive nasalization, see E. B. Williams, "Three Irregular Portuguese (and Galician) Imperfects," *Modern Language Notes*, XLIII, pp. 467-471.

¹² F. Adolfo Coelho, *Theoria da Conjugação em Latim e Português*, Lisbon, 1870, pp. 29 and 30.

¹³ Carl von Reinhardtstoettner, *Grammatik der portugiesischen Sprache*, Strassburg, 1878, p. 212.

presence of forms of the 2d plu. with *d* and of others without *d* in the *Leal Conselheiro* of King Duarte indicated the simultaneous use of these forms at the time this work was written (between 1428 and 1438),¹⁴ Leite de Vasconcellos¹⁵ argues that this apparent simultaneity is due to the fact that King Duarte retained the *d* only in passages quoted from older texts, either through fondness for the quaintness of these texts or disinclination to take the trouble to adapt their orthography. He supports his contention by the identification of quoted passages and the observation that in official royal documents (reign: 1433-1438) King Duarte always used forms without *d*. With this question thus settled Leite studies two earlier texts than the *Leal Conselheiro* but without date, the *Historia dos Cavalleiros da Mesa Redonda* (probably middle of fourteenth century), and the *Livro de Esopo* (probably end of fourteenth century),¹⁶ in both of which *d* is still retained, and a much later text, dated 1448, the *Chronica de Guiné* of Gomes Eannes, in which *d* has disappeared. He further examines two documents from southern Portugal dated 1402 and 1410 and a document of Evora dated 1418. The document of 1402 contains the following forms: *conhecades, solvades, consintades, digades*, that of 1410, *tenhaes* along with the stereotyped expression, *comprades e façades comprir*, found commonly as late as the end of the century and therefore valueless;¹⁷ the document of 1418 contains the form *leixedes*. From this evidence Leite concludes that the critical period during which the change took place was the first quarter of the fifteenth century. Additional forms have been collected and are arranged below in chronological order.

date	forms	work ¹⁸	volume	page
1390	queredes, desedes, etc.	AH	I	57
1390	pronüciades, condapnedes, etc.	AH	III	24
1395	aiudedes, fazedelhas, etc.	AH	X	210
1401	ponhades, fazedelhes, etc.	DC	I	318
1405	fazernosedes, creades, sabedes, desedes, etc.	MP		65 to 68
1411	busquedes, dedes, guardade	AH	IV	45
1416 ¹⁹	trabalhades, stades, etc.	RL	I	336 & 338

¹⁴ Cf. Aubrey F. G. Bell, *Studies in Portuguese Literature*, Oxford, 1914, p. 44.

¹⁵ "Fórmãs verbaes arcaicas no *Leal Conselheiro* de el-rei D. Duarte," in *Mélanges Chabaneau*, Erlangen, 1907, p. 176.

¹⁶ The vagueness of the date of the *Livro de Esopo* is indicated by the fact that Leite believes it to be a *leitura nova*, i.e. a fifteenth century copy of a fourteenth century manuscript, in which certain archaisms of the original were preserved; cf. *O Livro de Esopo*, Lisbon, 1906, p. 121.

¹⁷ Other similar expressions are: *e hūs e outros al nō ffaçades and sabede*.

¹⁸ AH is abbreviation for *Arquivo Histórico Português*; DC, for *Dissertações chronológicas e críticas*, by João Pedro Ribeiro, Lisbon, 1810-1819; MP, for *Catálogo dos manuscritos portuguezes existentes no museu britannico*, by Frederico Francisco de la Figanière, Lisbon, 1853; RL, for *Revista Lusitana*.

¹⁹ The *Livro da Montaria* of João I, which was probably written between 1415 and 1433, contains only forms with *d*. But this document cannot be considered of any value in the present discussion because it is based on a copy of 1626, the language of which is marked by numerous characteristics of seventeenth century Spanish. See *Introdução* to edition of Francisco Maria Esteves Pereira, Coimbra, 1918.

1434	dees, consentaaes	AH	III	86
1436	dizeis, leixaseis, teries, etc.	DC	I	319
1437	ponhaaes	AH	III	101
1437	leixees, fazee	AH	III	84
1441	costrangaaes, fazee, etc.	AH	III	105
1451	tomees, consentaaes, etc.	AH	VIII	36
1451	façaaes, cōsentaaes, etc.	AH	VIII	45
1452	prendaaees, etc.	AH	II	183

This new material amply confirms the conclusion of Leite. Certainly by the year 1435 intervocalic *d* in the 2d plu. had completely disappeared from non-dialectal Portuguese documents.

EDWIN B. WILLIAMS

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

SPANISH COLMENA, PORTUGUESE COLMEIA

IN the *Revista de filología española* (6.340), A. Castro refers thees words and Galician "*colmena*" to *columella*. The Galician form is *colmea*. Meyer-Lübke considers *culmus* the general basis, but fails to account for the suffix.

To explain *colmena* beside *colmillo*, Castro asumes a disimilacion ov *-ella* to *-ena*, and compares it with the development ov **conucula* from *colucula*. Doubl consonants were not commonly subject to disimilativ changes in erly Romanic. And the formacion ov **conucula* contradicts Castro's theory. We shoold expect the *l* ov *colus* to protect the *l* ov the diminutiv; why did it not become **colucuna* or **colucura*? Evidently the asociacion ov *-cula* with the same suffix, in countless other words, kept it from undergoing a special change in eny singl word. And the same thing wood be tru ov *-ella*, an extreemly common suffix. Disimilacion wood hav produced Portuguese **cormella*, later **cormela*, and Spanish **cormiella*, later **cormilla*. But if we admit Castro's general idēa, the suffix shoold hav become *-enna* (Spanish *-ieña*). There is no reason why disimilacion ov *ll* shoold produce a simpl *n* instead ov *nn*. The entire theory is founded on wrong asumpcions.

The suffix ov *colmena* and *colmeia* reprezents the final porcion ov Greek *smēnē*, latinized as **smēna*. Greek *smēnē* is the regular plural ov *smēnos*, but the sense 'bee-hives' is such that singular and plural cood eazily be confuzed. Aparently *smēnē* was sometimes uzed as a singular in Greek; in eny case the common ending *-ē* wood naturally become *-a* in Latin. With regard to the general basis, Meyer-Lübke's idēa seems better than Castro's.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

PROPERTIUS, LAUDATOR TEMPORIS ACTI

LENGLET-Dufresnoy's Marot edition¹ calls attention to a famous passage of the *Roman de la Rose*, in which Marot supposedly found inspiration when writing his rondeau, *De l'amour du siècle antique*. The passage, well-known through Bartsch' *Chrestomathie*,² is a lengthy praise of the bliss and happiness of the Golden Age of mankind. According to Bartsch and to Langlois,³ Ovid⁴ was Jean de Meung's

¹ La Haye, 1731; II, 192.

² 12th ed. revised by L. Wiese, 1920, p. 251 ss.

³ *Origines et Sources du Roman de la Rose*, 1890.

⁴ *Metamorphoses*, I, 88 ss.

authority for depicting the charms of the "Age of Innocence," even though Jean de Meung refers merely to *letre* in general in the third line of the passage. Still, Ovid's panegyric lacked one important feature of Jean de Meung's enthusiasm,—the praise of love in olden times. It would be too hasty a conclusion to infer from the omission that Ovid was perfectly satisfied with the woman of his day. Misogyny, often represented as a privilege of the mediaeval *bourgeois*, was a sentiment familiar to the Ancients also. Invectives against woman, a ubiquitous motive in the literature of the mediaeval Third Estate,⁶ and particularly strictures on woman's greed and duplicity, were a topic common to the elegists of Rome, to Tibullus⁷ and Propertius⁸ as well as to Ovid.⁹

One elegy of Propertius (III 13), however, joins all motives of Jean de Meung's praise of yesteryear. Jean de Meung's *Ami* is led to eulogize primitive mankind by deploring the cupidity of "modern" woman. After a series of Ovidian reminiscences, he continues:

"Seur teus couches con je devise,
senz rapine et senz couvoitise,
s'entracoloient et baisoient
cil cui li jeu d'Amours plaisoient.
cil arbre vert, par cez gaudines,
leur paveillens et leur courlines,
de leur rains seur eus estendoient
qui dou soleil les defendoient."¹⁰

Propertius, after having contrasted the corruption of Roman women with the purity of Oriental wives, recalls with a wistful sigh the innocence of the Golden Age:

"Felix agrestum quondam pacata juvenus,
Divitiae quorum messis et arbor erant" (*o.c.*, v. 25-26).

A fruit fresh picked, a basketful of berries, a bouquet were welcome gifts in those times; the scenery of this bucolic love is almost literally paraphrased by Jean de Meung:

"His tum blanditiis furtiva per antra puellae
Oscula silvicolis empta dedere viris.
Hinnulei pellis stratos operibat amantes,
Altaque nativo creverat herba toro,
Pinus et incumbens lentas circumdabat umbras . . ." (*o.c.*, v. 34-38).

It is characteristic of the two epochs that whereas Jean de Meung goes on to a general consideration of the consequences that resulted from the passing of pastoral beatitude and uses the opportunity to write a virulent diatribe against kings and princes and private property, the Roman poet deplores in patriotic despair the state of his fatherland and predicts the downfall of Rome.

In view of the dearth of Propertian manuscripts before Humanism,¹⁰ Jean de Meung's paraphrase ought to be of interest to students of Classical Philology also.

But a close examination of Marot's poem will show that his inspiration could

⁶ Théodore Lee Neff, *La Satire des femmes dans la poésie lyrique française du moyen âge*, 1900.

⁷ II, 4.

⁸ II, 13; III, 11.

⁹ *Ars amatoria*, II, 275 ss.

¹⁰ Bartsch, *o.c.*, 252, v. 77-84.

¹¹ Martin Schanz, *Gesch. der röm. Lit.*, II. Teil, I. Hälfte, 1911, p. 261.

be due only partly to the *Roman de la Rose*. While the passage in question depicts the lovers as not caring for gifts or presents (*sens rapine et sens couvoitise*), Marot is specific, and instead of a negative, he says:

"Un bouquet donné d'amour profonde,
C'était donné toute la terre ronde . . ."

A bouquet of flowers was one of the modest gifts by which Propertius' innocent lover courted his sweetheart:

"Ille munus erat decussa Cydonia ramo . . .
Nunc violas tondere manu, nunc mixta referre
Lilia virgineos lucida per calathos . . ." (*o.c.*, 27-30).

It is a known fact that Marot read Propertius, and thus, it is probable that he found his model rather in the elegy of Propertius than in the *Roman de la Rose*.

Since Birch-Hirschfeld,¹¹ it has been a much debated question how far the Roman Elegists influenced Marot. On Roedel's, Guy's, and Wagner's painstaking labors, Villey's summary pronouncement: "Voilà de quoi prouver tout au plus que Marot avait lu Ovide, Properce et Tibulle . . ." ¹² may be justified. And yet, in spite of recent attacks on "source-hunting," ¹³ sources may be useful and instructive. In the case in question, a comparison between Marot and Propertius is illuminating for a fuller comprehension of Marot's genius. The contrast between the two is striking, and it directly proves that Marot's *fond de sensibilité* was, after all, not negligible.¹⁴ Propertius is more specific and plastic than Marot; but his plasticity and realism lack that emotional and sentimental tone which has kept Marot a "modern" after four hundred years.

ARPAID STEINER

HUNTER COLLEGE

¹¹ *Gesch. d. frz. Lit. seit Anfang des XVI. Jhdts.*, 1889, I, 120.

¹² *Les grands Ecrivains du XVIe s., Rabelais et Marot*, 1923.

¹³ L. Cazamian, *Criticism in the Making*, Macmillan, 1929, p. 3 ss.

¹⁴ Plattard, *La Renaissance des Lettres en France*, 1925, p. 97.

REVIEWS

Melville Best Anderson, *The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri: A Line-for-Line Translation in the Rime-Form of the Original*, San Francisco, John Henry Nash, 1929, 4 vols., folio.

Professor Melville Best Anderson devoted over a quarter of a century to the actual translation of *The Divine Comedy* in English *terza rima*, and we venture to say that previous to this "delightful labor" Professor Anderson spent another quarter of a century in study and research. By virtue of his achievement in "recreating" Dante's Poem in English, and for his scholarly studies on the Poet, Professor Anderson takes a unique place among the Dantists past and present. His name will pleasantly and inevitably call to mind Norton, Toynebee, Grandgent, Fletcher and others.

Some of the other versions heretofore rendered on the *Comedy*, though having their redeeming features and high qualities, have been found wanting in more ways than one. We can say with conviction that rarely up to the present has one soared to the heights of poetry in translation-form, sustaining in its entirety the essence of Dante's creation. Carlyle, Rossetti, Byron, and others have given translations which come close to the spirit and form of the original, yet these have either been episodes or fragments, or, at most, a canto. Professor Norton's prose translation and Longfellow's version in blank verse have been useful and inspiring, but the Dantesque vein frequently lags, and sometimes is lost sight of completely. In his line-for-line translation in triple rhyme, Professor Anderson has not only preserved the beauty and dignity of Dante's masterpiece, but has imparted to it the qualities that make the translation "read like an English poem." This he has accomplished no matter how defying the task may have been—whatever despair some of the subtleties of the great Poem may have offered. Should any other person with less genius, with less profound knowledge, with less love for the task than Professor Anderson have undertaken the work, the translation, we are sure, would have failed to see completion:

"Per che, pensando consumai la impresa
Che fu nel cominciar cotanto tosta."

To think that Professor Anderson was discouraged by some of his colleagues in his project! On the contrary, far from discouraged, and, moreover, undaunted by examples of previous failures, Professor Anderson has tried to surmount every obstacle, and has, let it be repeated, given to posterity of the English peoples a poem which reads like a counterpart of the *Divine Comedy*, faithful to the lofty spirit of the "loftiest of poets." Nor has Professor Anderson gone without reward for his huge undertaking. His own words tell us of the many happy hours spent in communion with his "Master": "There were moments when I felt near the Master,—when he seemed to take the pen out of my hand and show me how the lines should read in English. Moments of happy, stimulating illusion, such as come to the translator as the supreme reward of fidelity!" It is indeed a privilege to give here a few passages along with the originals,—passages taken for the most at random, except those reproduced on the frontispiece plates of this issue of this magazine. This we have done to give an idea of the uniformity of the translation which, similar

to the *Commedia*, rises everywhere to poetry of transcending beauty. Note the clarity achieved in this extract:

"Manifold flocks of naked souls I saw
Who all did woeful lamentations pour,
And they seemed subject unto diverse law.
Supine were lying some upon the floor,
And some were sitting all together bent,
And others went about forevermore.
The more were those who round about there went,
And fewer those who lay in torment low,
But had their tongues more loosened to lament."

"D'anime nude vidi molte gregge,
Che piangean tutte assai miseramente,
E pareva posta lor diversa legge.
Supin giaceva in terra alcuna gente;
Alcuna si sedea tutta raccolta,
Ed altra andava continuamente.
Quella che giva intorno, era più molta;
E quella men che giaceva al tormento,
Ma più al duolo avea la lingua sciolta."

In the following passage the poetic simplicity of the original is retained in the translation:

"'Turn, Beatrice, turn,' so ran their lay,
'Thy holy eyes upon thy servant leal
Who moved his steps to thee from far away.
Of thy grace to us, graciously reveal
Thy smile to him, so that he may discern
The second beauty which thou dost conceal.'"

"'Volgi, Beatrice, volgi gli occhi santi'
Era la sua canzone, 'al tuo fedele,
Che, per vederti, ha mossi passi tanti!
Per grazia fa' noi grazia che disvele
A lui la bocca tua, sì che discerna
La seconda bellezza che tu cele!'"

The next extract shows striking fidelity to the original:

"Then as a chiming horloge doth ring
To rouse the Bride of God to matin-song
Unto the Spouse, His love soliciting,
Where one part draws another and thrusts along
With tintinnating note harmonious
Whence love in well-tuned spirit waxes strong,—
The glorious wheel I saw revolving thus
And render voice to voice, in concord blending
With sweetness never to be known of us,
Save in that place where joy is never ending."

"Indi come orologio, che ne chiami
Nell'ora che la sposa di Dio surge
A mattinar lo sposo perchè l'ami,
Che l'una parte l'altra tira ed urge,
Tin tin sonando con sì dolce nota,
Che il ben disposto spirto d'amor turge;
Così vid' io la gloriosa rota
Muoversi, e render voce a voce in temprà
Ed in dolcezza, ch'esser non può nota,
Se non colà dove gioir s'insempra."

And now, relative to the essays which make up the introductory volume, let it be said in passing that, in addition to being gems of English prose, they offer information on Dante and his *milieu* which is as historic as it is colorful and vivid. To illustrate just one instance of the charming device used by the author in presenting his material, let us reproduce in fragment a picture of Dante as seen by the fictitious, thirteenth-century English traveler, Roger Purbeck,¹ or "Ruggiero Perbacco" as the Florentines would have put it in their own terms (the scene takes place in the home of the Portinari; an evening reception. Roger Purbeck is engaged in conversation with Giovanni Villani, the chronicler of old Florence, when two gentlemen of distinction enter upon the scene):

"These," whispered Giovanni, 'are Guido Cavalcanti and Dante Alighieri.' As soon as there was a little lull, he hurriedly told me more concerning them, being naturally unaware of all that I had already learned. 'Guido,' he briefly remarked, 'is not only one of our first gentlemen of high lineage, but is a man of great parts, being both philosopher and poet. His father betrothed him early in a marriage of state to the daughter of the renowned Farinata, then the Ghibelline leader and master of Florence. Dante, by nature and intellect our greatest man, is now leader of the bolder faction of the White Guelphs, those who would stir the Cerchi to more spirited opposition to the designs of Pope Boniface.' While Villani was speaking, I gazed at Dante who was embracing Ricovero² with great tenderness. After the first salutations had been exchanged, I guessed that Ricovero was asking permission to introduce me. Coming over to where I stood, Ricovero, first greeting Villani and craving his pardon, led me where I was face to face with him to me of living men the most admired. Clasp my hand firmly, Dante bade me welcome to Florence, gently adding: 'Ricovero has told me such things of you as make me hope we may be friends.' When, soon afterwards, Dante turned his face toward Guido, I noted the aquiline contour of his nose and his underhung jaw, the lower lip projecting a little. This peculiarity gives his face in repose a somewhat grim expression; otherwise his features are those of a sensitive spirit under iron self-control. In manner he is beyond all others gentle and urbane. 'A great favorite with the ladies,' quoth my friend Giovanni. Despite his modest mien one somehow feels an underlying self-confidence, if not outright pride. He is not one to multiply words, which are to him no counters but coin, and that golden. He gives you the sense of vast resources in reserve. In no mood this evening for much talk, he answered with sharp concision and simple clarity every question, whereupon that powerful jaw would close like a trap. A little later I saw him chatting easily and graciously with a lady of the Portinari, but even then I fancied that his thoughts were far away. No wonder if cares of state weigh heavily upon such a man at a moment when Florence, like a ship in a storm with no strong hand at the helm, is like to be crushed between such clashing rocks as threatened the Argonauts. Philip the Fair of France is in league against the peace of Florence with mean King Charles of Naples, both being tools in the skilful hands of the terrible Pope Boniface. Meanwhile the Emperor Albert of Hapsburg sits inert beyond the Alps, suffering the garden of the Empire to go to waste. Perhaps, if one could read the thoughts of Dante now, they would be found to be preoccupied with the traitorous intrigues at Rome of his own powerful and able kinsman, Corso Donati, who is more than suspected of advising the Holy Father to create a Tuscan kingdom for a member of the Gaetani family" (Chap. II, pp. 30-31).

From Chapter III (p. 34) on the author abandons historic fiction and devotes himself to outlining history, *per se*, with the Florence of Dante as a background. Lack of space robs the reviewers of the pleasure to quote much fascinating information contained in these studies, destined to serve as indispensable reference for all students and scholars.

¹ Character appearing in Chapters I and II (see pp. 6 and 30) which for "critical purpose" the author has couched in "fiction masking historic truth."

² Brother of Beatrice and friend of Roger Purbeck (see p. 15, Chapter I).

And now, digressing a bit from our premise, the question arises as to the difficulty of diffusing this de luxe edition. Though a work of art in printing and binding, this edition will, because of its price, exclude many a lover of Dante from owning a set, and, more regrettable still, fail to reach university or municipal libraries. A service of infinite value could be rendered to American scholarship if some benefactor would make it possible for libraries of large centers to have sets at the disposal of the public. (Even this review could not have been made were it not for the kindness of Mr. and Mrs. English Walling, who placed the volumes at our disposal for consultation.) In view of the fact, then, that this special edition will serve only as a monumental marker, and that the first version published by the World Book Co. (1921) is either exhausted or nearly so, we urge a republishing of the work for use in university classes and for the public in general.

For a description and *raison d'être* of this edition permit us to give herewith an interesting outline made by its printer, Dr. John Henry Nash, in his announcement prior to the publication:

"It is my privilege to announce the forthcoming publication of an English verse translation of THE COMEDY OF DANTE ALIGHIERI OF FLORENCE, the work of Melville Best Anderson. Dr. Anderson started this translation twenty-eight years ago. He chose as his poetical medium, terza rima or triple rime, the nearest English equivalent to the Dantean verse form. Many other attempts have been made to translate Dante in English terza rima; most of them were unfortunate, and hitherto none could be called a true success. That Dr. Anderson has achieved greatly where others failed may be stated on the authority of Paget Toynbee, the late commendatore, Guido Biagi, and other Danteans of high rank. Dr. Toynbee, in particular, has watched Dr. Anderson's undertaking with sympathy and has encouraged it with praise.

"The story of this Dante publication begins with 1923. In that year Aurelia Henry Reinhardt, President of Mills College, suggested to me that I should devote myself to a monumental publication for the honor of California. About the same time Dr. Reinhardt introduced me to Dr. Anderson, and I learned of the great work to which Dr. Anderson was devoting the ripest years of his life. Having obtained Dr. Anderson's permission to print this DIVINE COMEDY, I immediately prepared plans. In 1924 I went to Europe to consult with the Van Gelders of Amsterdam and this famous old house began the fabrication of a special water-marked paper. The text meanwhile was being composed two pages at a time as proofs were revised and re-revised by Dr. Anderson. Last year I made a second trip to Europe, and arranged to have the books hand-bound in classic vellum tooled in simple gold lines by Hubel and Denck of Leipzig. The sheets of all four volumes are now in the hands of these great bookbinders.

"Dr. Anderson's Dante is presented in four volumes. The first volume is devoted to a series of introductory essays, in the first of which Dr. Anderson vividly and colorfully recreates the Florence of Dante as seen through the eyes of a contemporary English traveler. One volume apiece is given to the Inferno, the Purgatorio, and the Paradiso. The books are of folio size, and contain no ornament except type and rule, from cover to cover. The type is Cloister Old Style Lightface, the Dante marking the first use of this cutting.

"From the beginning it was my ambition to make this Dante my *magnum opus*. I endeavored to assimilate the advice that Jean Grolier (1479-1565) wrote to his protégé, Aldus, in a letter that is a classic expression of the printer's responsibility.

"You will care with all diligence that this work, when it leaves your printing shop to pass into the hands of learned men, may be as correct as it is possible to render it. I heartily beg and beseech this of you. The book, too, should be decent and elegant; and to this will contribute the choice of the paper, the excellence of the type, which should have been but little used, and the width of the margins. And if this decency and elegance shall increase your expenses, I will refund you entirely. Lastly, I should wish that nothing be added to the original or taken from it."

"It is my sincere hope that I have met these requirements. For more than five years now I have been reverently turning the pages of the great poet, striving always to make this presentation of his masterpiece a monument alike to him, to his translator, and to the printing art. It has been an experience rich in intellectual reward. The intimate association with Dr. Anderson that the work involved has been a delightful privilege—a privilege of a sort that I have come to value more and more as the years follow one another, deepening the appreciation of mental gifts. The result seems to round out my Dantean labors which began when I printed Boccaccio's *Life of Dante* as a gift for my friends."

In conclusion let us repeat a recent judgment on Professor Anderson's translation in that it was destined to preclude the probability of another ever being attempted. It is our privilege, too, to say that Professor Grandgent's opinion is that it combines accuracy with real beauty.

O. A. BONTEMPO
JOHN L. GERIG

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

SOME STUDIES ON RIMBAUD

Marcel Coulon, *La Vie de Rimbaud et de son Œuvre*, avec de nombreux documents inédits ou ignorés, Paris, Mercure de France, 1929.

François Ruchon, *Jean-Arthur Rimbaud, sa Vie, son Œuvre, son Influence*, avec un bois dessiné et gravé par William Metein et deux hors-texte, Paris, Honoré Champion, 1929.

A. Rolland de Renévill, *Rimbaud le Voyant*, Paris, Au Sans Pareil, 1929.
Arthur Rimbaud, *Correspondance Inédite*, précédée d'une introduction de Roger Gilbert-Lecomte, Paris, Aux Éditions des Cahiers Libres, 1929.

These studies on Arthur Rimbaud fall into two distinctly unlike groups. The first two form what is undoubtedly the most comprehensive survey we have had thus far of the life and works of one of the great rebels in the poetic heavens of the nineteenth century. The last two are the most original contribution to an understanding of his incredible genius.

Truly Rimbaud flashed through the literary skies like a veritable meteor, consuming and turning into bitter ashes everything terrestrial and human he encountered on his brief pilgrimage. He vent the fire of his irrepressible ire on everything art and life had held holy up to then. No altar was sacred enough for his anathemas. In words of a radiant and burning resonance, he threw down the gauntlet to gods and men. He rose in his Quixotic ecstasy to pose, at least in his own eyes then, and increasingly so in the eyes of a small but worshipful progeny now, as the passionate revolter, the anti-social, the Antichrist, and even, in the end, as the anti-poet. Finding the civilization of the West too apathetic for his tumultuous adolescence, and in apparent spiritual stagnancy, his volcanic genius lifted high its flame as if to set divine fire to all that was, to whatever seemed to his hallucinated vision old, decrepit, and dying; to whatever was worn out by physical, social, and moral disease. The verses from his youthful mouth must have sounded to an Izambard, to a Verlaine, like the angry, and yet divinely captivating admonitions of a young and virile prophet. This child felt that he was rising from the dust, from the depth of soulless tradition, fear, social stratification, and nerveless religion, to lead man back to his pristine glory as the *fils du Soleil*. And it was because he felt he had failed, because his hysterical genius wavered in the end before the stupendous indifference, or stupidity, of mankind that he made the great sacrifice, and destroyed the secret of that magic alchemy from which he had extracted so many miraculous verses.

Of the works here under consideration, those by MM. Coulon and Ruchon are the more comprehensive and the more judiciously planned interpretations of the life and work of the poet; but that by M. de Renéville is the more inspired, if more controversial, summing up of the significance and message of the "Voyant." All of them are the very opposite of what "romanced biographies" are. They are proof of what scientific criticism can achieve when it is served by the intelligence and the intuitions. As M. Coulon says:

"Historienne, érudite, psychologue, esthétique: *intégrale*, sachant marcher sur le sol de l'anecdote comme battre le ciel spéculatif de son aile, la Critique permet à un esprit créateur une création aussi pure, originale et définitive que l'œuvre d'imagination."

No less than all that is required to get at the riddle of Rimbaud.

While he is still a student in rhetoric, under the indulgent but over-cautious guidance of his teacher Izambard, he spreads his wings laden with spiritual dynamite. In the Spring of 1870, he lifts his vision above the black turmoil of those somber months, and to the then regnant political and social upheaval, he opposes the individual, but more terrible frenzy of the anarchy he sets adrift in his mind. He writes to Th. de Banville: "Je ne sais pas ce que j'ai là, qui veut monter." And he is only fifteen. But his dazzling genius leaves us already aghast with its wondrous daring. He is already a fallen angel with the piercing darts of a Satan on his tongue, with an irremediable knowledge of good and evil in his heart, and an unquenchable desire to rise above both.

Rimbaud's poetry, M. Coulon shows, is the most autobiographical of any poet's, not excluding Villon's. Not one of his verses but speaks a phase of his melodramatic adolescence in terms of a spiritual transmutation. Not a mood of his oppressed childhood but finds an echo in his haunting words. The poetic import of his poems is thus enhanced by the critic who shows their all too-human sources. M. Ruchon's exegesis, on the other hand, is rather impersonal, and somewhat frigid. This is a dangerous method in dealing with a temperament like Rimbaud's. Reality in the brief years of his poetic consciousness, by eluding constantly his physical grasp, compelled him to withdraw within the fantastic reality of his inner being. Therein all his earthly, sodden acts and feelings were metamorphosed into unearthly music, of which only the echo resounds in his verses. The critic who will not enter into that world with utter sympathy had better leave out all hope of ever hearing that music.

Rimbaud's spiritual anarchism knew no literary or social frontiers. His scorn for the literature of his contemporaries and ancestors was boundless. "Racine, peuh! Victor Hugo . . . pouah! Homère? Homère!" He speaks of the dull exoticism and starched classicism of such poets as Lisle, Banville, with frightful satire:

"Tas d'œufs frits dans de vieux chapeaux. . . ."

In the matter of mere artistic form, however, so far as his *Premiers Vers* are concerned, Rimbaud owes much to Hugo, Banville, Gautier. But it is to Baudelaire and Verlaine he owes most, especially the musicality of such poems as *Les Chercheuses de Poux* and *Voyelles*. His search for a musical ultimate ended in a dilemma, especially in the last poem. He turned then to prose.

"Trouver une langue, qui sera de l'âme pour l'âme, résumant tout: parfums, sons, couleurs. Une langue définissant la quantité d'inconnu s'éveillant . . . dans l'âme universelle . . . permettant à ce voleur de feu qu'est le poète de faire sentir, palper,

écouter ses inventions. Une langue grâce à laquelle si ce que le poète rapporte de là-bas a forme, il donne forme; si c'est informe, il donne de l'informe."

That is the theory of the language of *Illuminations*. M. Ruchon's analysis of them is most valuable precisely in this connection. His is not a mystic interpretation of Rimbaud. He studies the poet's technique in so far as it is possible with erudition and insight. For the first time he gives us a general survey of Rimbaud's versification that reveals something of the inner mechanism of that "Alchimie du Verbe" which has remained an invulnerable secret with the poet. Ruchon insists that Rimbaud was not a *vates*, a frenzied spirit writing under the spell of his unconscious self, as the surrealists claim. On the contrary, his aesthetics, he tells us, rest on a system that was willed, conscious, artificial. And yet it is when most apparently so that his hallucinations become most mystifying. Casting his emotions, his passions, his deliriums into the crater of his willful genius, he invites misunderstanding, scorn, hatred, even death, morally, to reach the infinite core of life unshackled, naked to the depth of his soul, and more intact than a deity before the act of creation.

So it is in *Bateau Ivre* that one can approach closest to the fiery pit in the soul of Rimbaud; for whereas *Illuminations* are hermetical, and apparently beyond all human reason and rhyme, or as M. Ruchon will make us believe they are: "vanité et tourment d'esprit, bruit de chimère bombinant dans le vide," *Bateau Ivre* retains the sequence of reason and human logic. The tread is not broken between dream and reality. The poet's thirst for ultimate freedom, for the unknown, for the absolute finds in it its intensest expression. When he reaches *Illuminations* he has broken all his moorings. The "Voyant" gives us glimpses of the unearthly visions he sees in his itinerary. They are the intoxicating ravings of one who finds human expression too stilted, too theatrical to speak his naked truth. His "Alchimie du Verbe" sparkles with new and strangely phosphorescent glimmers. He steals from chaos, or the absolute harmony of things, some hard, dazzling gems of light. But they blind our earthly vision rather than illumine it. So his failure, and there is failure, lies in his inability to discover a language that transcends the power of silence, of the silence that must fall upon anyone who beholds the central mystery of life. And so, in the case of Rimbaud, after this failure, his maddening descent into the vortex of nihilism had reached an impasse. There was nothing else for the disillusioned sky adventurer to do than to flee, not only from life, but also from himself:

"Europe, Asie, Amérique, disparaissez. . . ."

But as if ultimately conscious of the hopelessness of his revolt, his nihilism, the poet adds as an after-thought at the end of the poem: "(Ce n'est rien, j'y suis, j'y suis toujours)." This faculty of the poet never to lose absolute and ultimate contact with hard reality is what makes M. Ruchon, I suppose, consider Laforgue rather than Rimbaud the ancestor of the surrealists whose aesthetics is founded on a complete "absence de tout contrôle exercé par la raison," to quote A. Breton's *Manifeste du Surréalisme*. But that is only a matter of degree.

This again is what renders his religious affiliations so speculative a matter, and as elusive as gossamer threads. Brought up in the strictest Catholic atmosphere, he turned out to be if not most anti-Christian, certainly a very Antichrist. His antagonism to the Church was both social and aesthetic. He rejected it as an instrument of oppression of the poor, and of oppression of the flesh. He turned to the paganism of Venus to be redeemed from what he considered its dissolving curse:

"J'étais bien jeune et Christ a souillé mes haleines. . . ."

All four critics here reviewed are unanimous in their estimate of Rimbaud's anti-Christian feelings, and find themselves at odds with M. Claudel who sees in Rimbaud one of the most Catholic of nineteenth century poets, and his own spiritual god-father. It is true that as M. Ruchon declares with regards to *Une Saison en Enfer*: "il n'est pas difficile d'y trouver des textes pour l'une et l'autre thèse," and yet to interpret Rimbaud's religious spirit as Isabelle Rimbaud, as Paternie Berrichon, as Henri Bordeaux, and as M. Claudel have done it is to put more of one's self in the text than there is in it. One must, of course, bow to the deeper insight and supreme authority of M. Claudel in matters of poetry, especially religiously inspired poetry. But may it not be that much of the Christian mysticism he finds in Rimbaud is only a reflexion of that which shines in his own spirit? At any rate, the anti-Christianity of Rimbaud fairly staggers one who reads him with no Catholic talisman to shield his piety. He seems truly then like a reincarnation of Satan challenging not only human morality and justice, but also Christian goodness and love.

M. Coulon casts much light on many obscure episodes in the intriguing career of the poet. Regarding his relations with Verlaine, both Coulon and Ruchon agree with Berrichon that "la Vierge folle" can be no other than "Pauvre Lélian." To believe with Delahaye, and more recently with Louis Pierquin, that Rimbaud was referring to his "amie ardennaise" is to destroy the real significance of *Délires I*, and render the interpretation of *Une Saison* doubly difficult. To Coulon again we must turn for accurate data regarding his relations with Germain Nouveau; for his perpetual struggles with Vitalie Cuif, his Flemish mother; and for his stoical, pragmatic, infinitely tragic pilgrimage through Africa in the last few years of his life after his abandonment of his *folie littéraire*, his *folie altruiste*.

If M. Coulon's book is the more lucid and rational exposition of Rimbaud's enigma, and M. Ruchon's is the more academic and impersonal treatment of it, M. de Renéville's is the more ingenious. For what, after all, was the secret spark that lit up the genius of Rimbaud for a moment only to become extinguished soon after like a vanishing star? M. de Renéville sees in Vedic and Brahmanic literatures the source of Rimbaud's rebellious mysticism. The evidence he bares to attest his thesis is rather inconclusive, and consists of his alleged readings from Oriental books in the library at Charleville. Granting the critic's hypothesis, however, his thesis is most convincingly and startlingly developed. The various Upanishads teach that man is but a spark sprung from a great universal fire which is the spirit of God. Without being a god, the individual is part and parcel of it. M. de Renéville takes Rimbaud's famous expression *Je est un autre*, and interprets it in terms of Brahmanic philosophy. He has an intriguing art of forcing Rimbaud's verses to say anything he wishes them to say. His effort to collate passages from Rimbaud with excerpts from Oriental religions lends much color to his argument. To Rimbaud's preoccupations with an "Achimie du Verbe," with what is suprasensible, and with the idea of the Absolute, he tags Oriental and Pythagorean epithets. He shows Rimbaud aiming at the Absolute through what is sensible even at the risk of, and perhaps only at the cost of destroying the physical universe as our senses know and feel it. Asceticism, he declares, is one of the avenues to travel to reach the central blessedness of Nirvana, and, following M. Berrichon's Romantic coloring of his brother-in-law's sufferings in Paris, M. de Renéville declares: "La vie se chargeait donc de renforcer l'ascétisme que Rimbaud désirait pratiquer." But when Rimbaud left finally for Paris, with *Bateau Ivre* in his pocket, he was not craving asceticism. He was not craving it when he wrote *Soleil et Chair*. Rimbaud's

confession to Delahaye on "Juinphe," 1872, from Paris: "Maintenant c'est la nuit que je travaince," seems to M. de Ren  ville conclusive evidence of the poet's ascetic, meditative, and Oriental bent of mind, although most poets have also the same unconventional craving for silent communion with the night, and although a poem of Rimbaud written at exactly the same period as the letter just quoted: *Bonne Pens  e du Matin*, has nothing ascetic or Oriental about it.

Many passages in Rimbaud, however, lend support to M. de Ren  ville's occult theories according to which the poet is a "fils de l'Orient par l'esprit." Didn't he write: "Qu'a-t-on fait du brahmane qui m'expliqua les Proverbes?" And again: "Je retournais    l'Orient et    la sagesse premi  re et   ternelle." And there, M. de Ren  ville holds, Rimbaud discovered the occult center where lies that divine unity in which good and evil are forever reintegrated. Nothing is further, of course, than this from the Christian concept which regards good and evil as irreconcilably divided. Rimbaud's aim, we are told, was to escape this duality, and attain to the Absolute unity of divine Love. But to reach it is by the same token to give up all effort at earthly action and expression. The wonder adventure ends thus in a blind alley, for the artist, for to express it is to lose it, at the same time. In his highest flight the poet was doomed to silence in a world of expression. "Cela s'est pass  . Je sais aujourd'hui saluer la Beaut  ." Which brings us to the same conclusion as that of the more rational exegesis already referred to.

M. de Ren  ville's thesis is fascinating, but too labored at times. One does not have to make of Rimbaud a disciple of cabalism or of Mrs. Annie Besant to get at the inner radiance of his poetry. Such a treatment was to be expected, however, from a firm follower of surrealism. Incidentally, the letters of Rimbaud are also edited, or simply introduced, by an ardent surrealist who, as he declares in a footnote, considers the book of M. de Ren  ville we have been reviewing "le seul ouvrage sur Rimbaud que je puisse admettre." This *Correspondance* is *in  dite* only in name, for all these letters are well-known to students of Rimbaud. They include all those he wrote between 1870-1875 with which literature is concerned. Those to his mother from his earthly inferno in Africa are excluded, and are of little moment. But here, brought together, with the poems he enclosed in them, are those soul-revealing letters he wrote to his friends: that to Izambard of May, 1871; the so-called "lettre du Voyant" to Demy  y of May 15, 1871, upon which we depend for much elucidation of his   sthetics. Towards such an elucidation MM. de Ren  ville and Gilbert-Lecomte contribute much that is both controversial and illuminating. M. Ruchon, on the other hand, beclouds the whole ticklish problem when as the conclusion of a remarkably clear and instructive work he has only this to say regarding Rimbaud's most hermetic poems: "une ombre: id  e banale ou enfantillage." He redeems himself, however, with a most complete, scholarly, and timely "Bibliographie Rimbalienne" for which we must be very grateful.

Rimbaud's revolt against society, against literature, and against life were varieties of his poetical frenzy. He suggests a solution to life's muddle, but it is a solution that invites its own destruction. He would annihilate all so-called civilization and substitute for it the rarefied vision of a mystic, and especially of an Oriental mystic. Brought up in a petty, morally stifling atmosphere, he erected upon a scaffolding of reality that is topsy-turvy an edifice of surreality breath-taking in its immateriality. His poetic span extends over four years of his adolescence, at the end of which, in full meteoric blaze, he fell to earth, to bury his burnt genius in the clay of the earth.

Rimbaud joins in him the visionary to the positivist; the mystic to the critic. He feels the itching desire to tear asunder the veil that shrouds the secrets of life. Then his vision clears—he sees it all with the eyes of a rationalist. “Moi, moi qui me suis dit mage ou ange, dispensé de toute morale, je suis rendu au sol, avec un devoir à chercher, et la réalité rugueuse à étreindre! Paysan!”

That is why Rimbaud is Romantic and most anti-Romantic; why he can influence poets so dissimilar as Valéry, on the one hand, and Claudel and the surrealists, on the other. Nothing brings out more completely this complexity of his nature than the two groups of studies we have been reviewing, one of which is a rational exposition of his life and art by two clear-thinking scholars, and the other a mystic interpretation of it by two avowed theosophists. Both sides can say with equal sincerity and reason: “Behold the true Rimbaud.” For Rimbaud is, indeed, many while he remains always and essentially one and indivisible.

S. A. RHODES

THE COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Daniel Mornet, *Histoire de la Clarté française*, Paris, Payot, 1929, in-8., 358 pp.

M. Mornet a conquis une célébrité légitime avec ses études littéraires, et son *Histoire de la Clarté Française*, sujet bien rarement traité à cause de sa difficulté reconnue, lui fait trop d'honneur pour ne pas mériter un examen attentif. Examinateurs donc la thèse de M. Mornet.

Bien qu'il existe dans la plupart des bonnes œuvres françaises une clarté relative, cette clarté, loin d'être instinctive, est le résultat d'une élaboration réfléchie. Au Moyen Age, la scolastique donne une certaine précision de la pensée et inspire plus tard la méthode cartésienne, mais c'est la rhétorique omnipotente qui a donné les plis invincibles à la pensée, car du XVI^e siècle jusque vers 1870 elle règne en maîtresse dans l'enseignement. Ce dernier, toujours conservateur, a corrigé plus ou moins toutes les révoltes contre les règles, et les traditions de l'enseignement ont aidé au maintien de la tradition littéraire. La rhétorique semble avoir disparu de l'enseignement mais, aujourd'hui encore, malgré les assauts des romantiques, des réalistes et des symbolistes, l'intelligence française est en grande partie gouvernée par cette loi de rhétorique qui veut qu'on parle avec clarté, et qu'après avoir choisi ses raisons, on les dispose dans l'ordre le plus convaincant. Cette discipline générale a défendu la pensée française contre les deux défauts vers lesquels elle semblait se précipiter irrésistiblement, la préciosité et le burlesque. Durant trois siècles, la rhétorique réduisit la clarté en méthodes, règles et principes. Pour être claires, les idées doivent être parfaitement déterminées, et la rhétorique détermine exactement le genre, le but, les procédés, les qualités et les défauts d'une œuvre. Pour le choix des idées, un des codes essentiels de la rhétorique est la théorie des *lieux-communs*, ou méthode pour découvrir et présenter des arguments qui puissent servir à tous les sujets, ce qui donne l'avantage d'une clarté commode et sûre. La composition oratoire, à son tour, ordonne les idées, et par elle, la rhétorique devint le guide du théâtre aussi bien que de la poésie lyrique et épique.

Un des principaux efforts du XVII^e siècle est de simplifier la langue pour la préciser et lui donner l'aisance et la souplesse. Ce fut l'œuvre des grammairiens, de Balzac, de Malherbe, et surtout de Vaugelas. Grâce à eux, la clarté devint le principe fondamental de la langue et du style dans la génération de Boileau, et le P. Lamy peut écrire en 1688: “Le génie de notre langue est la netteté.” Le but des classiques a été la clarté permanente, universelle, basée sur la raison générale, in-

dépendante des individus, lieux ou temps, ainsi que la description de ce qu'il y a de stable dans la nature. Ils ont rejeté, au contraire, l'accident, le particulier, ce qui ne rentrait pas dans l'expérience commune. Tout ceci conduit les classiques à la théorie du beau raisonnable à laquelle se joindront, au commencement du XVIII^e siècle surtout, l'esprit de finesse et de géométrie.

Pour résumer M. Mornet, la scolastique d'abord, la rhétorique toujours, et dérivant de cette dernière, la raison, les lieux-communs et la composition oratoire, ont créé la clarté française. Il leur joint en second lieu, la doctrine de l'imitation des anciens, le but moral de l'art, la culture mondaine et le goût de l'analyse psychologique.

M. Mornet expose les conséquences fâcheuses de la rhétorique et de l'esprit classique. En dépit du charme contenu dans l'œuvre des grands écrivains, la clarté classique, simple et nue, conduit à une limpidité sans saveur, et transpose la vie en une sorte de discours d'où la réalité vivante, confuse et compliquée est nécessairement absente. Sous la rigidité tyrannique de la rhétorique en quête de clarté, les œuvres de la pensée deviennent un art aristocratique et artificiel rejetant toute une part de la beauté, tandis que le purisme et la préciosité préparaient l'appauvrissement de la langue.

M. Mornet décrit les révoltes contre la rhétorique et l'esprit du classicisme. Après que l'abbé Dubos eût substitué le *beau de sentiment* au *beau raisonnable*, Diderot et surtout Rousseau, opposent à une littérature basée sur les règles celle qui jaillit des instincts aveugles qui ne prennent pas le temps d'être clairs, si bien que la passion, le sentiment et le cœur deviennent la force essentielle de la vie. Dès 1760, le XVIII^e siècle ne demande plus à la nature des impressions d'harmonie, mais des chocs de sensations et des tumultes d'émotion. Rousseau montre que la langue française était faite autant que toute autre pour émouvoir et il crée le *style sensible* en opposition au *style clair* des classiques. La philosophie du sentiment prend la place de la philosophie de la raison. Le progrès des sciences expérimentales montre que la pensée humaine n'était ni immuable ni partout semblable à elle-même, mais complexe, mobile et diverse. La fixité de la langue classique est ébranlée, et l'on reconnaît la nécessité des néologismes puisqu'il faut des mots nouveaux pour expliquer les pensées nouvelles. Bientôt après, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre crée le *style pittoresque et plastique* que perfectionnera Chateaubriand.

Se révoltant plus hardiment que le XVIII^e siècle, le Romantisme représente la complexité mouvante de la réalité, il frappe la sensibilité et l'imagination sans besoin de comprendre et de réfléchir notre émotion. Balzac emploie toutes les langues, tous les argots, les patois, la langue du peuple et des métiers, comme le feront plus tard les naturalistes tels que Zola et Huysmans. Durant cette période s'ébauchent, chez Chateaubriand et chez Gérard de Nerval, les conceptions nouvelles de la poésie intuitive.

Le symbolisme, cependant, a été la vraie réaction contre la clarté. Plus d'idées, plus de sentiments clairs, mais bien l'inconscient ou le subconscient, la recherche du principe de la poésie dans le domaine de ce qui n'est plus intelligible où les musiques et les colorations seules des mots importent. Verlaine introduit le rêve et Rimbaud l'hallucination dans la poésie. Le théâtre suit les mêmes chemins, quoique plus lentement, chez Ibsen et chez Maeterlinck. Actuellement, Valéry prétend nous apporter des poèmes d'idées pures. Une telle pensée n'a rien de commun avec la pensée commune, la raison pratique, et l'ordre logique qui nous était familier depuis les classiques est totalement brisé. Symbolistes, unanimistes et surréalistes, sont

les poètes des mondes d'instincts et d'extases, où la pensée s'élance et la vie se déroule, poussées vers l'inconnu par des forces obscures et mystiques.

Certains points de détails peuvent intéresser ceux qui enseignent l'histoire littéraire. La pensée du Moyen Age a eu pour but la recherche du symbole, la confusion qu'on y trouve était faite d'ignorance et est le produit d'une doctrine étroite enfoncée dans les subtilités. L'œuvre des humanistes, masse lourde et confuse, vient de ce qu'ils savaient trop de choses sans discerner où elles les conduisaient, témoin Rabelais, et Montaigne lui-même ne fut pas exempt de cette pédagogie de quantité. La Renaissance française embrasse trop de pensées nouvelles, elle préfère délibérément la richesse à la simplicité, la somptuosité à l'ordre, l'éclat à la clarté. La Pléiade tombe dans la même erreur, et Ronsard prisait surtout ses odes pindaresques, odes si savantes qu'elles en sont pesantes et obscures. L'impression de clarté et de simplicité donnée par la période classique est assez trompeuse car on n'en doit pas juger seulement à travers les œuvres de Racine, Molière, Bossuet et La Fontaine. Ces derniers, quant au fond, sont restés aussi pédants que leurs prédécesseurs, car tous entassaient préfaces, examens et discours pour défendre leurs œuvres. Descartes, réellement, pense comme ses contemporains, il ne leur apprend pas à penser.

Quelques passages du livre de M. Mornet méritent d'être signalés en raison de leur valeur intrinsèque. L'étude sur la théorie des lieux-communs (Part. I, ch. III), et un résumé excellent de la clarté française et du symbolisme (Part. I, ch. IV); une explication de tout premier ordre sur la clarté (Part. III, ch. I, II, III), et une table montrant l'influence de la rhétorique sur le mécanisme descriptif des passions, reproduite de *La Philosophie morale expliquée en tables*, de Louis de Lesclache (1651), pp. 168-169.

Tout en admirant la puissance de travail et les dons intellectuels de M. Mornet, quelques critiques s'imposent, car la clarté française qu'il veut décrire est enfouie, perdue même, dans son livre trop complexe et un peu confus. En donnant trop d'exemples, en déversant trop de notes, il abuse de l'érudition qu'il condamne chez les écrivains du XVI^e siècle. A ce propos, pourquoi intitule-t-il le chapitre premier du livre: *La Renaissance*, alors qu'il n'accorde à cette dernière que sept pages sur vingt-cinq? Le chapitre trois de la deuxième partie explique l'abus de la rhétorique dans la tragédie au XVI^e et au XVII^e siècle, ainsi que la fureur qu'on avait d'écrire tragédies et comédies au XVIII^e siècle, mais la clarté française qui fait le sujet du livre n'y est pas mentionnée. Malgré son désir, M. Mornet a surtout écrit une histoire méthodique des variations de la pensée dans la littérature française, celle aussi de la rhétorique et du mécanisme des genres suivant les périodes littéraires. Un point encore; si de 1817 à 1824 on vend 1,598,000 volumes de Voltaire contre 492,500 de Rousseau, est-ce bien dû, M. Mornet l'implique, au fait que Voltaire suit la méthode rhétoricienne? N'y-a-t-il pas là une raison historique plus importante que la rhétorique? Rousseau est le champion d'une démocratie dont la Révolution a déçu tous les espoirs, tandis que Voltaire, porte-parole d'un libéralisme pratique et clair, attire à soi les libéraux de l'Europe coalisés contre les buts et l'esprit de la Sainte-Alliance.

Pour en finir, quelle impression la clarté française fait-elle sur M. Mornet? Il nous dit que sa qualité de professeur le range parmi ceux qui souhaitent que le goût de la vérité claire des classiques ne soit pas vaincu puisqu'il nous a donné des chefs-d'œuvre. Un peu partout dans son livre, cependant, il constate que cette vérité claire est artificielle et ne représente pas suffisamment les réalités de la vie et il conclut

ainsi: "Quand il y a désaccord, inadaptation de l'une à l'autre c'est la clarté qui doit s'adapter à la réalité et à la vie et non pas la réalité et la vie qui doivent être mutilées sur le lit de Procuste de la clarté." Rien de plus juste, mais ceci ne fait pas de M. Mornet un partisan de la clarté. En fait, c'est un moderne. Ses études admirées de tous sur la pensée du XVIII^e siècle ont fait de lui, sinon un disciple de cette pensée, du moins un apôtre de la théorie du progrès en littérature.¹

EUGÈNE E. ROVILLAIN

UNIVERSITÉ DU MICHIGAN

M. Romera-Navarro, *Miguel de Unamuno, novelista-poeta-ensayista*, Madrid, 1928, 328 pp.

The writings of Miguel de Unamuno have not received in the past the amount of critical attention that his position in the Generation of '98 would seem to have demanded. An unsympathetic critic has said that this vigorous and dynamic Basque's personality has so overshadowed his work that few have taken the trouble to read him. Yet no one of that vaguely defined group, not even Baroja, offers so likely a subject for a relatively definitive study. Certainly not Azorín nor Valle-Inclán, whose present display of alacrity in marching abreast of the younger men makes one pause before attempting an evaluation. Even Baroja moves forward, if only in the company of his heroes, who are grown mellow, more sentimental and more rheumatic. Unamuno, however, remains the same, even in his latest work, perhaps just because of the dominance of his personality and because he has in a measure anticipated the younger writers.

Sr. Romera-Navarro, in the present book, is the first to undertake anything like a complete survey of Unamuno. The order in which he takes up Unamuno's writings, indicated in the title of his study, has no special significance. For him, as for most people, Unamuno is first and foremost an essayist (p. 20) and his greatest work *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida* (p. 173). And as he finds more to censure in the poetry than in the novels of Unamuno, it may be supposed that he would consider the novels as more important, which is again the usual opinion. In general one will agree with Professor Romera's judgments, as, for example, when he finds *Niebla* to be Unamuno's outstanding novel and *La vía Tula* his least successful one.

If Sr. Romera's discussion of Unamuno the novelist can be criticized at all, it is not for what he says but for what he leaves unsaid or fails to emphasize. For instance, much could have been made of Unamuno's cultivation of what has been called the novel *démeublé*, as exemplified in the radical change made in his second novel and adhered to thereafter, of reducing to a minimum the description of characters and setting. Sr. Romera is of course aware of this, but he dismisses the fact in a sentence (p. 87). Yet it must figure prominently in any estimate of Unamuno's novels and is in fact, if its implications are considered, the only proper basis for such an estimate. For Unamuno's adoption of this change in technique implied his inability to handle successfully all the material at the artist's command, to create an organic whole out of the concrete and the abstract, as all great novelists have done. Witness his failure in *Pas en la guerra*. But out of this very weakness grew his strength, for scorning mere realism, he devoted himself henceforth to the

¹ L'édition très soignée n'a que peu de fautes typographiques. Il faudrait lire, cependant, *elle*, p. 35, 1.7; *1630*, p. 52, 1.32; *raisonner*, p. 93, 1.35; *conversation*, p. 97, 1.32; *semer*, p. 101, 1.13; *programmes*, p. 111, 1.31; *adroit*, p. 117, 1.17; *navfrage*, p. 252, 1.35.

invention of such delightfully ingenious mentalities—characters would be too material a name for them—as appear in *Amor y pedagogía* and *Niebla* and of those sombre personifications of human wills and passions that inhabit the timeless and spaceless world of the later stories. The fact that Unamuno has more than once thought it necessary to defend his method—in *Niebla*, in the prologue of *Tres novelas ejemplares* and in that of the second edition of *Pas en la guerra*—would seem to call for some consideration of that method.

One is tempted, moreover, in view of the recent tendency in Spain toward greater intellectualization of the novel, to examine into the possibility of Unamuno's influence. Do not his fictions foreshadow those of such contemporary writers as Benjamín Jarnés? Full justice has not yet been done Unamuno as an innovator. He has sometimes been compared to Pirandello in his attitude toward his characters, and it has been pointed out that without knowing *Sei personaggi in cerca d'autore*, he conceived the amusing and original situation of having the hero in *Niebla* rebel against the author. What I have not seen stated yet is that Unamuno, as far back as 1897 and 1902, in his first two novels, attempted, though apparently without realizing its possibilities, the 'stream of consciousness' method that has since become, with the advent of psychoanalysis, of such great importance in the modern novel.

When he comes to study Unamuno the poet, Professor Romera finds much to criticize in him on the side of form. A close scrutiny of Unamuno's best volume of poetry, the *Rosario de sonetos líricos*, uncovers numerous flaws: harsh, unpoetic vocabulary, ungrammatical constructions, obscurities, inversions and other censurable traits. In some instances one may feel that Sr. Romera's criticism is uncalled for, that there is no need, for example, to find fault with "el temple diamantino de tu daño," with the poet's comparison of a flame with the crest of a wave (p. 130) or with his use of *enjambement* (p. 132). But in general the criticism is just and indeed more favorable to Unamuno than might have been expected.

For most people, I suppose, the poetry in Unamuno's nature is best revealed in his essays. Here is the full lyric expression, intense, paradoxical, illogical, of this modern mystic's doubts and affirmations. To these writings Sr. Romera devotes the last half of his book. The *Vida de don Quijote y Sancho* he shows to be a work of uneven merit. *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida* he summarizes by chapters. These two works and the remaining essays are then drawn on for a general exposition of Unamuno's fundamental thoughts and preoccupations: his deep concern with the religious problem, his conception of God, his belief in faith and hope, his ideas on intuition and intelligence and consequent distrust of logic, his passion for will and action. Sr. Romera establishes many points of contact here between Unamuno and a number of modern philosophers, beginning with Spinoza, many of whom have offered pabulum to his insatiable curiosity. A final section, less successful it seems to me than some of the preceding pages, attempts to determine Unamuno's contribution to the efforts of his generation to create a new and better Spain.

The most serious criticism to be made of Sr. Romera's book concerns omissions. The only error of fact that I have noticed is the statement, preceding Sr. Romera's comparison of Unamuno with Browning, that the former "jamás menciona el nombre de Browning" (p. 161). As a matter of fact Browning is mentioned numerous times in *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida* as well as in other writings of Unamuno. But Sr. Romera is more vulnerable on the side of omissions. In studying Unamuno the novelist, some brief mention at least might have been made of the short stories included in the volume *El espejo de la muerte*. (Unamuno himself has not failed to

group them with his novels: "mis cuentos—que novelas son.") No reference is made, either in the text or the bibliography, to a volume of Unamuno's poetry entitled *Teresa*, published in 1923. (Surely one cannot take seriously the subtitle: *Rimas de un poeta desconocido presentadas y presentado por Miguel de Unamuno*.) Sr. Romera says nothing, finally, of Unamuno's tragedy, *Fedra*, merely listing it in the bibliography, not however as a drama but under the essays as an *ensayo dramático*. These omissions do not seriously detract, however, from the value of Sr. Romera's study, which remains a useful guide to the understanding of one of the most complex and compelling figures in modern Spanish letters.

W. L. FICHTER

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Miguel de Unamuno, *Mist*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1928, 332 pp.

The English-speaking public is to some degree acquainted with the unique Spanish thinker and scholar, Don Miguel de Unamuno through translations of such works as *The Tragic Sense of Life in Men and in Peoples*, *The Life of Don Quixote and Sancho*, and *Solliloquies and Essays*. Through *Mist* (Unamuno's *Niebla*), excellently translated by Professor W. Fite, the public will become acquainted with one of his most purely imaginative works—a tragic-comic novel or *novela* as the author carefully characterizes it. By writing in this new form, Unamuno permits himself the widest liberties, violating the established notions of unity and action customarily observed in the novel.

The name of the town where the action takes place in *Mist* is not given. It might be any town in Spain. The action is, as it were, rigorously simplified and spiritualized. Since his *novela* is a conflict between souls which is fought within in the kingdom of the spirit, considerations of time and space become irrelevant and are reduced to a minimum. It is a record of what happens to a character without regard to sequence or importance. His characters, incarnations of himself, are intensely human. Their delineation is reduced to the utmost simplicity.

In *Mist*, as in his other works, Unamuno takes the public by the hand, looks into their eyes and tells them what is in his heart and soul in a lively, virile, exclamatory, perhaps disjointed manner, which is always striking. The *novela* is an extremely clever, satirical work—a brilliant commentary on humanity written by a philosopher and an artist.

The amazing and unhappy love affair of Augusto Pérez is the means by which Unamuno swings us back and forward into the world of fact and that of illusion. Augusto, who takes himself seriously, decides that life is but a vast mist of trifling incidents. Out of this mist emerges the beautiful Eugenia who makes him conscious of himself—that he is a man. Augusto is at last awakened and asserts himself by repeating to his little dog, Orfeo: "I have a character of my own. You bet I have! I am I! Yes, I am I!"

Since Eugenia is in love with another, Augusto vainly strives to have his laundry maid fill her place. He is in despair and is on the verge of suicide. He pauses, however, long enough to make a journey to Salamanca to ask Unamuno for advice. In this most witty and amusing chapter, his creator informs him that he has no independent existence, being but a figure in a tale that is told, and that he cannot commit suicide because he does not exist!

Don Miguel explains that authors, like God, kill their creatures when they can no longer think of anything for them to do. Then Augusto threatens to kill Unamuno

if he does not withdraw his death sentence! In self protection, the author must kill his creature. Augusto returns home and involuntarily succeeds in eating himself to death. With keen satire and exquisite grace, Unamuno writes an epilogue in which Orfeo delivers his master's funeral oration and says what he really thinks of his poor master and of the curious race of man.

Unamuno, the supreme individualist, the living soul of that Spain he loves so well, never wearies of affirming in all his works that man is an end in himself, not a means. In *The Tragic Sense of Life*, that passionate record of the adventures of the spirit that ranks with the self-revelations of Saint Augustine or Pascal, the Spanish philosopher, says: "They tell me that I am here to realize I know not what social end. I feel that I, like each one of my fellows, am here to realize myself, to live." The thought that man becomes exhausted by tending the machinery of progress wearies him. Unamuno believes society exists for man, not man for society, Referring to Unamuno on this point, Madariaga says:

"Man is in Spain a concrete being, the man of flesh and bones and the whole man. He is neither subtilized into an idea by pure thinking nor civilized into a gentleman by social laws and prejudices. Spanish art and letters deal with concrete, tangible persons. There is no more concrete, tangible person than yourself. We can only know and feel humanity in the one human being which we have at hand. It is by penetrating into ourselves that we find our brothers in us."

This searching within, Unamuno has undertaken with a sincerity and fearlessness which cannot be excelled.

Throughout Unamuno's works one feels his desire to be a whole man with all his affirmations and negations and a passion for the indefinable persistence of his being. This passion is a source of sympathy for all humanity. The philosopher seeks God through the individual soul, and the salvation of man, not from sin but from death, from annihilation. Immortality is at the very core of his thoughts and emotions.

The thought of Unamuno seems to fall into no definite philosophical system. The readers can only know him by knowing his loves, hopes, and despairs reflected in the writings which are part of him—the man. Constantly Unamuno asserts that the author develops himself while creating his work, which in its turn perfects itself in perfecting the author.

Don Miguel de Unamuno, the philosopher of paradoxes, of contradictions and strife—an awakener of the soul—is worth reading. "For a new friend enriches our spirit, not so much by what he gives us of himself, as by what he causes us to discover in our own selves."

PASTORIZA FLORES

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE,
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Baron E. Seillière, *Romanticism*, Preface and Translation by Cargill Sprietsma, N. Y., Columbia University Press, 1929, 66 pp.

In a long array of polemical volumes and several hundred articles, Ernest Seillière has for years been battling against that most ruinous of all social and esthetic diseases,—Romanticism. In company with Laserre, Maurras, Babbitt, and several others, he has exposed the personal weaknesses of numerous Romanticists, their immorality, their morbidity, their mental, esthetic and social aberrations and the lamentable rôle they have played in producing our "modern neurasthenia" and our "modern decadence."

No one will be tempted to call these opinions either new or startling. The dogma of modern decadence is a time-worn antique in the store-house of critical accessories; and the notion of a general physical "disease" underlying the manifestations of all modern art, is a relic from the times when Lombroso identified genius with madness and when Max Nordau proclaimed the "degeneration" of the "modern" art of the esthetic 'Eighties and 'Nineties. M. Seillière's opinions were formed during these far-off decades when the critics were fond of explaining even the most spiritual and ethereal work of the Symbolists by the influence of tobacco, alcohol and social diseases. To these tenets, he added after the fashion of Brunetière, the defense of the "tradition,"—of a Roman Catholic tradition,—thus establishing his critical equations: physical health and mental sanity are dependent upon the Tradition, which is the same as Intelligence, and is most completely expressed in the discipline of the Church.

It is somewhat astonishing to find that he holds that the best artistic expression of this Tradition is to be found in neo-classicism, in the imitation of the Greeks, who obeyed very different morals and lived up to a very different tradition than the ones which M. Seillière has defended with so much talent and persistency. It is obvious that his esthetic tenets remain in conflict with his esthetic principles. His mental attitude should logically have led him to the apology of a Christian and a moral Romanticism as exemplified in the *Génie du Christianisme*, which he cannot really reject for reasons exclusively ethical. The Abbé Brémond, more consistent in his reverence for the Catholic past, did establish the distinction between a "good," or moral, Romanticism and a "bad," or amoral, Romanticism. He objected to M. Seillière that "certaines façons de décrier le Romantisme me semblent mettre en péril, avec la poésie véritable, la religion elle-même. Néoclassicisme, rationalisme, le premier ne mène-t-il pas au second?" (*Pour le Romantisme*, 1923). One could object, of course, to the Abbé Brémond, that it would be just as easy to distinguish between a "good" or moral classicism and a "bad" or amoral classicism,—without invalidating, in either case, its esthetic value. And, similarly, the objections raised against Romanticism, are neither historic nor esthetic, but "moral." They reveal the moralist's point of view rather than the esthetic value of a work of art or its historical significance.

M. Seillière's "façon de décrier le Romantisme" is based upon his moral convictions, upon a few principles or prejudices which reappear in all his books. He proclaims a doctrine that could be expected from a Roman Catholic whose loyalties are those of his social caste,—the conservative nobility. His anti-Romantic doctrine has, therefore, the merit of being neither complex nor novel. This will be obvious as soon as we divest it from its somewhat sonorous terminology:

(A) Each individual and each social group is largely led by *Imperialism*. This term has not for M. Seillière its ordinary meaning, "the desire of conquest, of domination which powerful nations possess." It designates with him the vital and unavoidable impulse of each being or group toward domination and self-expansion. He uses *Imperialism* largely as a synonym for the *libido dominandi* of Christian psychology or Nietzsche's *Wille zur Macht*.

(B) With this "desire for power" is frequently allied, he stresses, a certain *Mysticism*. And here again he attributes to *Mysticism* a meaning of his own. It has with him no special religious connotation, it does not designate ecstasy or union with the divine; it is not a direct and supra-sensual road to knowledge by internal illumination. To him *Mysticism* simply means a tendency of human being or groups

to claim the sanction and the help of some supernatural power, which justifies our desire of domination.

When M. Seillière refers to "mystic imperialism" or an "imperialistic mysticism" in individuals or nations, he means a desire for power or domination, which justifies itself by an appeal to a divinity, or to a mysterious natural force, or to an abstract conception of any kind. The "Gott mit Uns," or the divine right of kings, or the rights of "superior race or of a chosen people," or the "unspoiled instinctive goodness" of the lower classes which fits them for government by domination,—all of these are forms of the same alliance of *Mysticism* and *Imperialism*, which means the alliance of the thirst for power with a justifying principle or a supernatural being.

M. Seillière recognizes that these two tendencies of the human being or of human groups are instinctive, ineradicable and general. Every individual and every group tends unavoidably toward expansion and domination, and wants to justify this impulse by claiming that "God willed it," that its actions are the consequence of a well-established truth or principle, or that they are in harmony with "the laws of nature," etc.

Indeed, the Abbé Brémond was justified in his fear that such an attack on Romanticism puts in danger *la religion elle-même*. This doctrine sheds a quite unholy light upon the origin and rôle of all religions and all philosophies: In last analysis they appear as masks of the eternal *libido dominandi*. They are, in a sense, machines of war and conquest. This universal scepticism would, of course, rob all doctrines (including M. Seillière's doctrine), of all transcendental value. His own anti-Romanticism would be, according to his own premises, a "machine de guerre," an exercise of his Will to Power, which claims justification through the invocation of a principle and an alliance with a divine being. He found this principle in *Reason* (which means to him Tradition) and his divine Ally in the God of all good Frenchmen a kind of a "Dieu des bonnes gens," or rather a "Dieu de la bonne classe sociale."

(C) But the very notion *Reason* was for M. Seillière a dangerous and double-edged weapon to use. He did not want at all to give free rein to the "critical intellect" like Voltaire; and he certainly did not desire to conceive it, like the rationalists, as a supreme and law-giving principle, *opposed to faith*. On the contrary, his Reason had to be identified with Faith. And, therefore, M. Seillière defines Reason as "the condensed social experience of which the morals, the philosophy of Christianity—or, rather, Catholicism,—are the most complete expression." In other words, Reason for him is neither a collective term for reasoning, nor the logical power that tends to order facts or observations into some more or less coherent system;—but it becomes identical with Tradition and Faith. And when M. Seillière describes himself as "un mystique de la raison," he does not intend to accuse himself of any rationalist heresy; he means that he is "un mystique de la Tradition et de la Foi."

It is rather remarkable that this anti-Romanticist professes a doctrine as anti-intellectualist as any form of Romanticism. Any rationalist would, of course, classify these principles as a form of the "abdication of the intellect." In any case, this elucidation of M. Seillière's vocabulary allows us to gauge the significance of his main reproach to Romanticism,—that it has removed the restraint of "Reason" (that is, Tradition and Christianity), and that it has, therefore, allowed the "mystical imperialism" (that is, lust for power and its "divine sanctions"), to run riot, unchecked, in man as well as in groups or nations. Romanticism, he says, unloosens all lusts, including the *libido dominandi*.

From this it should follow that during unromantic or classic periods,—when faith and tradition triumphed,—these lusts were bridled and held in check. Now it happens—strangely enough!—that the most classic of epochs, that of Louis XIV, remains far removed from all this virtue and all this restraint. It betrays a most unbridled lust for power and conquest, not only in the person of the *Roi-soleil*, but in the whole texture of the period. The persecution of the Protestants, the wars for European domination, are hardly proofs of the “restraint” of the *Wille zur Macht!* And as to the morals of the *grand siècle*, M. Seillière no doubt remembers the *Francion* or the *Drame des Poisons* or the *Messes Noires*, or the “diabolical possession” of the “religieuses de Loudun,” etc., etc.

M. Seillière has divided history into two armies in constant battle: the diabolical host of unrestrained Romanticists, who, unloosening the most unavowable *libidos* in man, destroy rule, law and morality in order to precipitate humanity into dark decadence,—and the celestial cohorts of the Classicists, who, tempering man's lusts and his devilish propensities to the creation of original art, teach him to respect every social convention, the classic tragedy and the novels of Henry Bordeaux. This respect for the “tradition”—which tradition? Villon or Rabelais are “tradition” too . . .—will lead humanity upward, climbing the hills of progress, in the resplendent sunlight of divine favor.

This conception of literary history seems to me too much like Bossuet's “finger of God” visible in history. M. Seillière is not primarily a historian; he is by choice and temperament a moralist who defends his conception of morality by “examples” which are not always historic, although frequently edifying. Mr. Sprietsma has, therefore, rendered a real service in providing us with an excellent translation of this very significant treatise on *Romanticism* by M. Seillière.

Jules Laforgue, *Six Moral Tales*. Edited and Translated by Frances Newman, New York, Horace Liveright [1929], 292 pp.

“Alas! Poor Yorick!” . . . After forty-two years of posthumous celebrity, Jules Laforgue has finally been translated, and his prose has come out of this ordeal, as out of a hand-press, strangely mangled and mauled, its lustre and delicate glamor dulled, deprived of the interplay of its intricate internal rhythms. . . . His *Moralités Légendaires* have been rebaptized *Six Moral Tales*, a lame title that would fit stories by Crébillon fils or Marmontel, but does not give a hint of the meaning of Laforgue's title. And his coquettishly complex prose, replete with intellectual innuendo, shaded and ambiguous, has been rendered into a flat monochrome, which has rather successfully removed all the subtlety from Laforgue's pseudo-naïve phrases.

This dolorous clown of the Infinite with his tearful smile, who, in the face of approaching early death, juggled with his heart and brain in an ironically unique performance,—cold despair before the “eter-nullity” of things and gods, and lives and suns and worlds,—has been *discovered* (Alas! Poor Yorick! After forty-two years! . . .), and brought home as a slightly funny, a slightly *scabreux* and daring article *à la mode de Paris*.

The translator tells us:

“No one else has offered Laforgue to America, and I am one of those American women who would leave Eldorado to come home and tell my acquaintances about the wonders I had seen in Eldorado. When an American woman enjoys the advantage of a week in Florence, she always comes home with a gold-tooled portfolio filled with carefully coloured prints of the gold and aquamarine painters of the earliest Renaissance. And no American woman who enjoyed the advantage of

spending a week in Paris last May can have come home without a collection of papers illustrated with the hats and the parasols and the little green iron tables and the *retroussé* girls which were the sudden blossoming of Dunoyer de Segonzac's genius . . ." (p. 25).

And she assures us that Laforgue is *dernier cri*, that she takes pride in her precedence of "presenting Jules Laforgue." (Alas! Poor Yorick! After forty-two years! . . .)

One cannot suspect her of having sounded the depth or felt the impact of Laforgue's cosmic jests,—of his insoluble conflict between an irrepressible Will-to-Live and an acute awareness of the nothingness of personal existence, of the aimlessness of all thought, art and action, of ultimate annihilation. She has, I am sure, not understood how, in another layer of his being, this nihilist was a "Knight of the Absolute," or again in another layer, the "Grand-Chancellor of Analysis," forever bent over his fluctuating feelings, to destroy them by corrosive self-criticism. He could adore—mockingly—the life-instincts or the intellect, and he could mock—adoringly—at the life-instincts or the intellect. From all these conflicts,—this constant struggle with the *Daimons* in his brain,—was born his tragic irony which, for being clownish enough on the surface, is nevertheless tragedy too poignant for pathos.

Now, the translator finds his stories "charming":

"His *Hamlet* was profound and tender and charming . . . his *Pan* is the most charming story any man has written about the Pastoral Age, that his *Perseus* is the most charming story any man has ever written about the Heroic Age, that his *Miracle of the Roses* is the most charming story any man has ever written about elegant invalids, and that his *Lohengrin* is the most charming story even a Frenchman has ever written about a bridal night" (p. 21).—*Charming?*

The very uncritical Introduction also attempts, of course, a Freudian explanation of Laforgue,—who escapes that to-day?—forgetting that (except for the *Miracle of the Roses* which is very Aubrey Beardsley), Laforgue's over-conscious, over-intellectualized tales, are by no means spontaneous flowering from a submerged subconscious mind.

"He knew the Unconscious about which we have just begun to learn, and his *Hamlet*'s play contained a quatrain which might have been written by a Freudian of the second generation."

But the *Unconscious* in Laforgue is derived from Von Hartmann's *Philosophie des Unbewussten* and refers, not to the Freudian *subconscious*, but to the unconscious life-force that moves the planets as well as man and created, by accident one day, Intelligence. It is a philosophic conception,—not a pseudo-pathological explanation of human acts, as is Freud's *subconscious*. The Freudian misinterpretations of literature,—especially by popular critics who have reduced Freud to a few lewd banalities,—are confusing enough. If, in addition to all the "Freudian twaddle," critics are going to jumble up the Unconscious, the Subconscious, the Hyperconscious, the Conscious, etc., I modestly confess that I do not understand. But, perhaps, one is not expected to understand?

One of the strangest suggestions made in this Introduction is the identification of Laforgue's *Hamlet* with—of all men and of all potentates—with William II, the former Emperor of Germany! Imagine William II, afflicted, like *Hamlet*, with "that sixth sense," the sense of the Infinite!! Was *Hamlet* mad? No, but he would have turned mad by now, had he read all that critics wrote about him. Another

strange suggestion is that Laforgue's *Lohengrin* is "as complex as any hero conceived in the complex brain of a Freudian of the second generation" and that it is possible "to read about the bridal night Lohengrin spent with his Elsa, and to become convinced that he was one of those young gentlemen who used to be given two years in Reading Gaol, but who are now given literary prizes." This opinion betrays, I am afraid, an absolute misunderstanding of the intellectual nature of Laforgue's art, of his self-mockery, his self-caricature. His *Lohengrin* is auto-biographical, but it depicts, in a larger sense, the "eternally masculine" in conflict with the "eternally feminine." Woman is an incarnation of the unconscious life-force, and therefore biologically wiser than Man, who clumsily tries to *understand* intellectually what Woman knows instinctively. The translator should have been put on her guard about the intellectual origin and significance of this story by its concluding paragraph:

"Et c'est depuis lors, qu'à de pareilles nuits, des poètes célèbrent froidement et inviolablement dans leur front certaine petite fête de l'Assomption."

All of this precedes a "translation" which destroys the esthetic value of Laforgue's work and which denotes an insufficient knowledge of the French language. Not to seem partial, I select my examples only from the first three pages of *Hamlet*: "La mer est le Sund, aux flots sur qui on ne peut faire fonds . . ." becomes "The sea is the Sund, with waves which belong among the other waves on which foundations cannot be built." Or, "L'assise de la tour . . . croupit au bord d'une anse stagnante" is rendered as "The seat of the tower . . . is a certain geological stratum that stagnates on the bank of a stream which is as currentless as its banks."! What prevented the translator from writing simply: "The foundation of the tower . . . rotted away at the edge of a stagnant creek" (pp. 139-140)? *Crapauds* is translated twice as *frogs*, instead of *toads* (pp. 140-141), a mistake which has a sad effect upon the imagery.

When a sentence is somewhat long or complex, the translator simply cuts it up into several sentences and adds some explanatory (?) fillings of her own (e.g., pp. 140-141), without any consideration for the harmonic construction of Laforgue's style. Laforgue describes, thus, the stagnant water:

"Cataplasme ça et là de groupes de feuilles plates en forme de cœur autour de rudimentaires tulipes jaunes, hérissée ça et là de maigres bouquets de jonc fleuris de frères ombrelles semblables, entre parenthèses, à la fleur de la carotte dans nos climats." The translator says: "And its complexion (of the water) has not been improved by the poulticing of flat heart-shaped leaves grouped around rudimentary yellow tulips, or hidden under the shadows cast by the sparse bouquets of flowering rushes which grow here and there like sunshades of white lace—and which, in the polite privacy of parentheses, look very elegant in that latitude, but which are nothing more than the blossoms of perfectly ordinary carrots when we see them in our own latitude" (p. 141).

This "translation," filled with weak verbiage of which there is no trace in Laforgue's text, is more than twice as long as the original. It is strange to see that the words "entre parenthèses," which mean "by the way," have been applied by the translator to the rushes which, "in the polite privacy of parentheses, look very elegant"!

Describing the same slimy and stagnant water, Jules Laforgue uses a striking image: "la maladie de peau de ce coin d'eau mure," which the translator renders lamely and unesthetically as "the unfortunate complexion of water" (p. 140). Some of these "translations" are memorable enough to go down to posterity. Laforgue speaks of "les petites gens . . . vivant de cancons de clochers," which

means, of course,—“living on small-town gossip.” This is here translated as “*living lives that were cancons dangling in a belfry*” (p. 176). Or, again, Laforque's Hamlet complains that Ophelia would end by committing suicide: “*Elle devait finir par là, ayant puisé sans méthode dans ma bibliothèque,*” which evidently means “having borrowed without method (books) from my library.” Hamlet wanted to stress the evil effects of haphazard culture upon the feminine mind. This is translated by Miss Newman as “*She had to end like that, after she soaked herself so aimlessly in my library*” (p. 179).

I refrain from quoting more. The whole “translation” is done with the same skill. Every one of the 292 pp. contains half a dozen serious errors: “*Une tirade de résistance*” (p. 149) is rendered as a “tirade about heroic resistance,” whereas any dictionary would have given the equivalent as “principal” or “main” speech. “*Si les temps étaient plus propres!*” is translated as “If the times were only tidier” (p. 156), instead of “more suitable” or “more favorable,” etc., etc. Sometimes passages from Laforque are omitted without apparent reason, as, for instance, “*Moi, si j'étais jeune fille . . .*” etc. (p. 5 of éd. Vanier, 1894). Did the translator find them too difficult?

It was indeed an act of daring to attempt to translate Jules Laforque's very idiomatic and very artistic prose without linguistic preparation,—and an act of daring of the publishers to bring out such a “translation” without competent supervision. And as to Laforque's fame in America . . . “*Alas! Poor Yorick!*” . . .

Jacques de Lacretelle, *Histoire de Paola Ferrani*, Paris, Flammarion, 1929, 226 pp.

This volume is chiefly remarkable as another sign of the strange spell Stendhal still exerts upon the recent generation of self-analytical novelists. From his “clandestine celebrity,”—to which M. Bussière referred, not long after his death, in the already respectable *Revue des Deux Mondes*,—and through the revelations of his talent by Taine and P. Bourget, his influence increased to a cult, *Beylisme*, that went to swell for a while the current of Nietzscheist *Culture du Moi* of pre-war intellectuals. But to the recent generation he appears again in another light: He is to them less a philosophic leader than a bitter and precise, a cool and yet vibrating analyst of Consciousness and all its infinite fluctuations.

And, indeed, it is possible to view Stendhal from several sides. He is multiple and complex to the point of escaping classification and pigeon-holing. Bourget saw in him one of the sponsors of “nineteenth century pessimism,”—and yet he exalted the vigorous and unscrupulous Italians of the Renaissance. Jules Lemaitre represented him as “paralysed by progressive analysis” (à la Amiel!),—and yet who fought a braver battle to the very end against life and its inherent injustice than Stendhal? I have read articles stressing his Classicism; he has been called “a psychologist of the school of Racine,”—and yet he praised Shakespeare above Racine, and Baudelaire derived his conception of Romanticism directly from him. No wonder, then, that others consider him as a *Romantique pur sang*, afflicted with Romantic amorality and irony,—and yet he held that to be a perspicacious philosopher and an analytic novelist one should be as “dry” as Immanuel Kant or as a practising prohibitionist, and without consoling illusions. Without illusions? But who ever harbored as many illusions about himself as that fat “notary,” Beyle-Stendhal,—defeated in life and love, but in his dreams a triumphator who rode magnificently through a festive existence and was secretly one with the heroes he admired?

From 1880 on each generation seems to find itself mirrored in his complex work,

and to discover some part of its tendencies in his contradictory personality. Zola claimed him as an ancestor of his Naturalism and Bourget as a precursor of the psychological novel. Dostoiewsky drew a Russian Julien Sorel in the character of Raskolnikow, in *Crime and Punishment*; and the cosmopolitan *dilettanti*, like Anatole France, found in him justification for their insatiable and wandering curiosity. One can argue that Proust is but a combination of Stendhalian analysis with the estheticism of a Montesquiou-Fézensac. . . . And in each generation there are those who have seen Italy "with the eyes of Stendhal."

Jacques de Lacretelle is one of them. In his *Histoire de Paola Ferrani* one rediscovers the attitudes of that ecstatic promenader among souls and cities: "Les paysages étaient comme un archet qui jouait sur mon âme" . . . J. de Lacretelle has also collected some rare and passionate souls; and he is practising that "lucidity," which some of the younger novelists oppose to the instinctive, spontaneous, "sub-conscious" writing of the *Surréalistes*. One of his stories, *En Marge d'"Amance"*, is intentionally a pastiche of Stendhal, an explanatory chapter to be added to this novel. The author of *Silbermann* and of *La Vie inquiète de Jean Hermelin* has brought with this volume new evidence of his Stendhalian qualities,—analysis, amoralism, restraint of style,—which were already evident in his earlier studies of adolescent and Jewish psychology.

G. L. VAN ROOSBROECK

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

ITALIAN BOOK NOTES

Massimo Bontempelli, *Il Neosofista e altri scritti*, Milan, Mondadori, 1929, pp. 272 (L. 12).

It appears that Bontempelli had a banner year in 1929, for, aside from producing a play (*La guardia alla luna*), publishing another (*Minnie la candida*), winning the Publishers' Prize for the best novel of the season (*Il figlio di due madri*), he found time, among other things, to put out in book form his journalistic contributions of 1920-1922. In the present volume the first part, *Il Neosofista*, is devoted to the discussion of problems that intellectuals had to face in post-war Italy,—problems which in a very indirect way predicted the advent of a strong government such as is exemplified by Fascism. In the second part of the book he offers philosophical travelogues in and about the Mediterranean (*Lettere da due mari*) and a trip to Austria Hungary (*Visita ai vinti*). In the preface the author states that at last he has succeeded in writing a "boring book," and were it not for his bizarre style and suppleness of thought (via sophistication and paradox) we should agree with him that it is certainly, in part, "un libro noioso," his auto-accusation.

Nicola Evreinov, *Il teatro nella vita*, with preface by Silvio D'Amico and translation under care of Teatrangolo, Milan, "Alpes," 1929, pp. 296 (L. 12).

Mr. Evreinov, the Russian playwright, offers here a light dissertation on the theatre interpreted in terms of life: everywhere about us, even in the animal kingdom, where there is organic life there is drama,—the mouse plays dead and the cat plays the indifferent, the cock-of-the-rock bird dances for his feathered audience, dogs at play give each other chase as after wild beasts, etc. Mr. Evreinov goes on to say that the theatre did not exactly have its origin in the days of the Greek *coryphaei*s but that it has existed always. In three hundred odd pages the author give, numerous observations to prove his premises. We venture to say, however, that in

the end it is Mr. Evreinov who is chiefly convinced and the reader merely grateful for the many interesting observations. We note with relief that the Italian edition of this work has excluded the lengthy chapter "In the Commission of Experts" (*Theatre in Life*, New York, 1927) contained in the English edition. It is a chapter with far-fetched discussions and strained repartee in which Mr. Evreinov plays the principal rôle among the experts, Tolstoy, Ibsen, Schopenhauer, Wilde, to mention a few. The Italian edition is to be commended for excluding such and other poorly chosen material found in the English text.

Alessandro Varaldo, *Il cavaliere errante*, Milan, Mondadori, 1930, pp. 402 (L. 12).

Italy of the tenth century is the background to this tale of chivalry. The author has been successful in imparting to this story a melancholy tone of a distant epoch when a cavalier's profession was war and wandering. Reproduced before us is that haunting horizon of dark towers and churches, of violent warriors and saintly men. The novel has an undertone of historicity depicting the Italy of that period when, in addition to internal discord, she struggled against foreign dominion.

Arnaldo Fraccaroli, *Peccato biondo*, Milan, Treves, 1929, pp. 213 (L. 11).

Fraccaroli's literary star is on the wane of late not in quantity of production but in quality. His recent books such as *America*, *A Girl's Paradise*, and *Hollywood* are impossible from the point of view of his observations on America, which, if not distorted, are either superficial or ill-chosen. To his last half dozen books of slight literary value he has added recently this play, *Peccato biondo*, which would be no departure from the rest were it not for its chatty dialogue and cursory plot. The play, among other things, contains a thin slice of sentimentality. This "blond sin" turns out to be a sentimental wife who leaves her husband to teach him a moral lesson, in consequence of which he falls in love with her all over again. The play, with its urban intrigue, because of its caricature and burlesque character, falls somewhat under the series of "grotesques" of which Chiarelli is the chief exponent.

O. A. BONTEMPO

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

FRENCH BOOK NOTES

Jean Dorsenne, *Les Filles de Volupté*, Paris, Lemerre, 1929, 225 pp.

In this book the romance of the South Sea islands is finally coming to its end. Since Melville and Loti and Gauguin's *Noa-Noa*, so many White Shadows have flitted along these golden beaches, encircled by deep blue seas, in quest of a perfumed paradise of primitive happiness! And they have brought us books, *Le Mariage de Loti*, and paintings like Gauguin's, in which Tahitian women dream with deep eyes of mystery, unfathomable in the shadow of their garlands of red roses with their poignant perfume. . . . But they saw these islands and these strangely beautiful women, only with the eyes of their desire; and—since they were artists,—they wove around them the legend of their unspoiled spontaneity, of their goddess-like abandon to the rhythms of life. Jean Dorsenne has met Loti's queenly Rarahu, that rarest flower among Tahitian beauties,—now a withered hag puffing away at dried leaves. She has told him her remembrances, among which Loti occupies but a very inconspicuous place. The sad International Lover never saw reality, never understood Tahitian beauties—or any other. In fact, it is doubtful whether he ever perceived clearly anything, or cared for anybody, except for that singularly feminine and feline comedian of dreams

—Pierre Loti and his "beautiful soul." His touching love-stories were faked. Practical Rarahu had been warned that the white "popaa" wanted love spiced with mystery, romance, moonlight beaches, primitive dances and primitive fears, superstitions, inexpressible melancholy and passionate jealousy. And, against due payment, she concocted the brand he yearned for. While getting clothing, a house, presents for her other lovers, she dispensed—with unmistakable talent,—primitive illusions to sensitive whites. For, Jean Dorsenne assures us, the real Tahitian, if natural, is as callous, sensuous, empty, insincere, calculating, greedy, petty, vain and mendacious as any among the civilized ladies of this earth. How much literature, how much Chateaubriand, how much borrowed attitude and natural pose did not go into the transformation of the egoist Loti into the Wandering Jew of all romantic loves? But, who can really care whether this unconscious comedian was met by actresses as glibly familiar with their rôle as he himself? Who does care,—"*pourvu que le geste soit beau*"?

Edmond Rostand, *The last Night of Don Juan* . . . translated by T. Lawrason Riggs. With an Introduction by William Lyon Phelps, Kahoe and Co., Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1929, vi+124 pp.

With rather characteristic exaggeration, William Lyon Phelps acclaims here again Edmond Rostand as "the greatest dramatic poet since Goethe." He demonstrates that Rostand's "masterpieces" exhibit to a supreme degree the three qualities which Goethe prescribed for "a masterpiece that shall hold the stage,"—human interest, ideality and humour. Now, Rostand was "a theatrical craftsman, he was a poet, he was a humorist," and, therefore, he lived up to the Goethian pattern of genius. . . . The demonstration is neat, quick and conclusive as that of a theorem,—though eminently refutable. But all "refutations" are futile in the realm of esthetic preference: they mainly serve to bring out either the psychological differences between two critics,—or a different kind of *parti-pris*. . . . This translation of *The last Night of Don Juan* is meritorious, and should render great service to those to whom the original—with its somewhat turbulent and flashy style,—still offers difficulties. The play was acted in English at the Greenwich Village Theatre during the 1925-26 season.

H. G. Martin, *Fénelon en Hollande*, Amsterdam, H. G. Paris, 1928, viii+230 pp.

This study of Fénelon's influence in Holland is an addition to the history of the European diffusion of his work, which has not been exhaustively investigated. In 1910 G. Maugin published his *Documenti bibliografici per la storia della fortuna del Fénelon in Italia*; in 1917, A. Cherel investigated his influence upon the French XVIIIth century in *Fénelon au XVIII^e Siècle en France*; and in 1926, A. Eckhardt published a *Télémaque en Hongrie* (Rev. des Et. hongroises). It is evident, however, that in order to complete the picture of Fénelon's wide-spread and international fame, other precise studies of the same nature should be undertaken for other countries. His works were "European" books, and after decades of increasing popularity some of them became class-texts, in use until recent times. In Holland he was with Boileau and Lafontaine, the most widely read of the authors of the "Grand Siècle"; and the popularity of an author in eighteenth century Holland is always significant since this country was the clearing house of international literature,—a distribution point through which the Germanic "hinterland" was reached.

The *Télémaque*, a book forbidden in France and which dared to criticize the weaknesses of the domineering *Roi Soleil*, was naturally welcome in Holland, the asylum of persecuted authors and censored writings. The French text was issued

there in at least forty-two editions during the eighteenth century, and the several Dutch translations were reprinted at least nine times. It influenced deeply certain Dutch works, such as the *Friso* by Willem Van Haren, or *Het Huwelijk van Telemachus en Antiope in Ithaca*, a comedy by J. Le Francq van Berkhey. Fénelon's *Education des Filles* had a double bearing upon educational theory and upon Feminism. For this reason Dr. Martin has added to his book a brief sketch of the work of certain Dutch feminists, of which the best known is Anna-Maria van Schurman's *De ingenii muliebris ad doctrinam et meliores litteras aptitudine*, 1641. In this discussion, Dr. Martin refers to a Dutch pamphlet of 1779, *Bewijs dat Vrouwen geen Menschen zijn* (*Proof that Women are no human Beings*), which he believes to be a Dutch work of the eighteenth century. It is, however, merely a translation or a shortened popular version of Acidalius' *Disputatio perijucunda, qua anonymus probare nititur mulieres homines non esse; cui opposita est Simonis Gedicii defensio sexus muliebris, qua singula anonymi argumenta enervantur*, of which there appeared an edition at The Hague in 1644. It was revived in the eighteenth century: In 1744, de Querlon's French translation was printed in Amsterdam with the title, *Problème sur les Femmes*; a few years later, Charles Clapiés gave a new French version, *Paradoxes sur les Femmes où l'on tâche de prouver qu'elles ne sont pas de l'espèce humaine*, 1767. The Dutch pamphlet of 1779 goes back, probably, upon one of the French versions of this well-known "jeu d'esprit."

After having surveyed early Dutch opinions on education, Dr. Martin comes to the conclusion that Fénelon's pedagogical work had little or no direct influence upon them, possibly because it entered into conflict with the Protestant spirit of the country. Much in the same way Fénelon's Quietism could have but a limited appeal in a country where a number of Protestant sects were preaching similar doctrines. Yet his *Démonstration de l'existence de Dieu* proved a very successful apologetic treatise: three French and three Dutch editions appeared in sixteen years. But, perhaps more than any of his works, it was the character of Fénelon that became a power for the propaganda of his ideas: he grew to be the symbol of the generous, tolerant and pure-minded priest,—a Man after the Savior's example,—persecuted by unchristian Catholics and a victim of the stern and dogmatic Bossuet. Dr. Martin's study is well poised and does not lay any claim for direct influences there where only parallel currents of thought entered into a momentary contact or combination. An American student has undertaken a study on *Fénelon in England*, which should help to complete the history of his role in the Philosophic century.

G. L. VAN ROOSBROECK

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Edmond Sée, *Le Théâtre français contemporain*, Paris, Armand Colin, 1928, 204 pp.

Le Théâtre français contemporain is conveniently divided into three "livres": "La vérité au théâtre; le théâtre français de 1894 à 1914; le théâtre de guerre et le théâtre d'après la guerre." E. Sée eulogizes Henry Becque and calls him "le chef de la Grande Ecole Humaine." This is a very far reaching and all embracing statement, for it seems that Becque is simply exact and honest in his realism as shown in *Les Corbeaux*. This title of "chef" might be claimed for many of the great French dramatists. Sée's analyses on the "Comédie Psychologique" include fine descriptions of Porto-Riche, Lavedan, Brieux, Bataille, Lemaître and many other lesser lights. François de Curel is splendidly portrayed in the "théâtre d'idées." Here we find *résumés* of the important plays which help in the comprehension of his psychological development. Among the symbolists, Claudel, Maeterlinck, Dujardin are well described. H. R. Lenormand, a master psychologist and symbolist, analyzes

"les réactions sentimentales, morales, physiologiques de ses personnages, contraints de lutter contre eux-mêmes et contre des puissances plus fortes que leur volonté. Et l'on pourrait qualifier *Le Simoun* de tragédie climatique." Jules Romains, the chief of the Unanimist school, is handled too hastily and scantily. *Knock, ou le Triomphe de la médecine* and *Le Dictateur* certainly deserve much better treatment and exposition. Sée should have given *résumés* of both these plays because the former shows some splendid "Molièresque" qualities and the latter shows a deep study of the Will-to-Power permeated with Romains' philosophy of "Unanimisme." In the "*Dictateur*" he accomplished the creation of a masterful character.

G. L. van Roosbroeck, *Alsiurette*: An Unpublished Parody of Voltaire's *Alsiire*, 75 pp.: and *L'Empirique*, An Unpublished Parody of Voltaire's *Mahomet*, Institute of French Studies, New York, 1929, 77 pp.

When, in 1924, Professor G. L. van Roosbroeck published his study on *Chapelain Décoiffé: A Battle of Parodies*, he opened up to scholarly investigation a field that had been long neglected, that of theatrical parody in France. His work has expanded into a bibliography that will contain over seven hundred titles for the eighteenth century alone.

The critical studies on *Alsiurette* and *L'Empirique* he has now published, are but two of some fifty odd parodies on Voltaire, few of which have been printed. Professor van Roosbroeck's introductions, developed in his usual erudite and inimitable fashion, are replete with valuable information. Names and works strike an unfamiliar note, and reveal an unknown field of letters: Carolet, Panard, Fuselier, Pontau, Parmentier, Montigny, and many others far too numerous to set forth. They illustrate the history of the "Théâtre de la Foire,"—a light, humorous, fantastic, though ironical milieu.

The vast amount of new material to which Professor van Roosbroeck has drawn attention is perhaps too much for one man to develop. Therefore, he has placed within the reach of a research group of which he is the leader, the opportunity to study these unpublished plays. As a result monographs on the Parody as a genre, or on Carolet, Favart, Fuselier, or studies on the evolution of the opera-libretto, as well as on such librettists as P. C. Roy, have been announced for publication. These investigations of a large amount of manuscript material, this reconstruction of the history of a genre that has a bearing upon all the great figures of the eighteenth century, will prove to be of major interest for literary history.

ELLIOT H. POLINGER

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Carlton J. H. Hayes, *France, a Nation of Patriots*, N. Y., Columbia University Press, 1930, x + 488 pp.

To the layman France is Paris with its gayety and song; to the student, France is the nation which inspired the world with the ideas emanating from the French Revolution. It is the nation which produced a military genius who dreamed of a world empire; it is the nation which has experimented with almost every conceivable form of government; finally, it is one of the nations which bore the greatest brunt of the late war and which, surprisingly enough, has almost completed its period of convalescence.

Today, the eyes of the world are turned on France. Since the war, it has gained more prestige, more influence, and power than ever before. Everywhere men are searching for a new panacea for a perpetual peace, and by some students France is regarded as holding a very powerful, strategic position in this movement. Perhaps the lessons of the war may not be taught in vain.

Professor Hayes, a scholar excellently versed in the problems of nationalism and a guide to many who seek a way for international harmony, has delved especially into the national psychology of the French people. He has examined closely the practical operations of those institutions which shape public opinion. To him, all Frenchmen, no matter what their political inclinations may be, are above all patriotic. But their patriotism is not the sort that plays the raucous tunes of imperialism, jingoism and nationalism "par excellence." He attributes their love for France to two main influences,—traditionalism and Jacobinism. In a measure, the lively air of de Lisles' *Marseilloise* sums up excellently the very essence of Jacobinism. Yet, in the eyes of every Frenchman—nationalist or internationalist—both these influences have their emotional values.

It may be said that this book is a very valuable and practical supplement to the tenets expressed by the author in his *Essays of Nationalism*, a work published a few years ago. The first chapter contains a brief, brilliant analysis of the French nationality. It may best be summed up in the words of the author: "French nationalism is the product of historical human cultural forces; it rests on tradition of politics, religion, languages, war, invasion, conquest, economics, and society." In this sweeping sentence, Professor Hayes really strikes the very core of nationalism as existent in every nation throughout the world.

In the following chapters particular stress is laid on the various agencies of social control in France: the Church, the Press, the School and other related educational institutions are each given a special chapter. There is much valuable material of importance to layman, student, and specialist. The study of the press reveals facts little known both to the French and the American public. It is of service to those who seek an understanding of French editorial opinion on international affairs.

In the last chapter Professor Hayes very emphatically stresses the tendency of the French people to regard their nationalism as an inheritance from the Jacobinistic ideals of 1789 and as a rightful step towards, and not away from, internationalism, for to the French, France is the "mother of internationalism." That is why the French government does not fear to put "patriotic" textbooks in use in public schools. The appendices contain an excellent digest of the texts in history for the rising generation.

D. K. ROTHSTEIN

NEW YORK CITY

RUMANIAN BOOK NOTES

N. Iorga, *Istoria literaturii românești, Introducere sintetică după note stenografice ale unui curs*, București, Editura Librăriei Pavel Suru, 1929, 206 pp.

Professor Nicolae Iorga publishes the stenographic notes of his Synthetic Introduction to the History of Rumanian Literature, a course of lectures delivered at the University of Bucharest. The result is not only a fascinating panorama of Rumanian history, language and letters, but also a very keen criticism of some extraneous influences. For, above all, it is the soul of the nation which must be revealed in its literature. Thus, he concedes the fact:

"I have not the intention to state what is very often said, that the nation's soul can be expressed only in the national language; this would be absolutely erroneous; you can write in Rumanian with an altogether foreign orientation and you can write in a foreign language with the greatest, the truest, and the most complex Rumanian soul."

This Rumanian soul is what Professor Iorga seeks in the epochs which he revives with such mastery, and in the works of the authors whom he knows so intimately.

"One wrote sometimes in our country in Latin and Greek, and later in French, but nothing was changed by this in the soul of those who wrote."

On the other hand, Vasile Alecsandri (1819-1890), who is considered as the first to introduce, and knowingly, the popular in his verse, has not Professor Iorga's endorsement:

"Because there is something in Alecsandri from a distant Levantine wind, of the Bosphorus shores, there is something of an Athanasios Christopoulos;¹ it is not sufficiently observed, but it exists."

The full expression of the Rumanian soul is to be found only in Mihail Eminescu (1850-1889):

"This is why the possibilities of Eminescu are infinite. What we admire and what will be admired as long as Rumanian will be spoken, as long as the accents of this sacred language will be on the lips of a live man, is the penetration of all these elements in the most vast synthesis made by the soul of a Rumanian. Yet all we have from Eminescu are the fragments of a genius hindered from giving the full measure of his immense possibilities."

These are but a few instances illustrating the master's attitude and method. The course in itself is a monument of erudition. Beginning with the creation of the literary language and continuing through its manifold aspects, from the first foreign background and the quest for native subjects, giving attention to the religious literature, analyzing the individualistic literature of the second half of the seventeenth century, taking up the scholars, chroniclers and writers of memoirs, the decadence of the ancient character and translations from the Greek church books, reaching the philosophic principles and Western poetic fashions, approaching autochthonous currents to borrowed romanticism, applying the French to Rumanian subjects, studying the return of the old Rumanian foundation, of the local spirit, and, finally, the new orientation of the young since 1900,—Professor Iorga distills the quintessence of Rumanism in his course which is but of an introductory nature.

It is interesting to note the attitude of the editor of *Sămănătorul* (The Sower) and leader of that movement which for a whole period ruled the realm of letters in Rumania. Speaking of his own literary school, Professor Iorga says that it was: "a general Rumanian current." And it advised:

"Receive your inspiration from Western literatures, from classic literatures, but do not become the slaves of the literatures of the passing moment."

Mihail Sadoveanu, *Zodia Cancerului, sau Vremea Ducăi-Vodă, Roman*, București, Editura "Națională" S. Ciornei, 1929, 2 vols., 240 and 242 pp.

This is an historical novel. The action takes place around the year 1679. Prince Alecu Rușet is the hero. He is the unfortunate son of the deposed Antonie-Vodă of Moldavia. He falls in love with Princess Catrina, daughter of Duca-Vodă, the shrewd and cruel ruler who hates the scion of his predecessor. Prince Alecu Rușet follows Princess Catrina from Moldavia to distant Constantinople and returns to meet death at the hands of her father.

The meager outline of the plot cannot convey the world of living characters in these powerful pages, the gorgeous descriptions of ancient Moldavia and Stamboul. Father Paul de Marenne, a French traveler and guest of both Moldavian and Turkish courts, adds an unusual charm to the society of the epoch. This subtle Westerner and the multitude of natives give, each in turn, color and movement to the narrative.

¹ Neo-Greek poet (1772-1847).

One cannot resist quoting at least once. Here is a portrait of that legendary and feared Sultan Mohammed:

"The great ruler received him with a smile on his face, tired and of a dull whiteness. Sultan Mohammed was then forty years old and had a kind look. Nothing of the cruelty of his ancestors burned in his gaze. He had his mother's blue eyes,—she had been a slave kidnapped in her childhood from Russia and brought to the seraglio by Crimean Tartars."

Mihail Sadoveanu's new historical novel reminds one of the best that has been written in the *genre*. It is to be regretted that no translation will ever render the packed beauty of his language which transforms the chapters into as many cantos of a winged epopee.

Perpessicius, *Mențiuni Critice, Seria I-a*, București, Editura Literară a Casei Școalelor, 1928, 376 pp.

Perpessicius (Professor Dimitrie Panaitescu's *nom de plume*) is a poet and critic of note. In this volume he gathers his articles which appeared during the last few years in various publications.

Perpessicius has an honest and often kindly attitude towards all forms of literary expression. His modesty prompts him to state:

"Because he is above all of a subjective temperament the author of this book wishes to see in this collection of literary chronicles, first a series of testimonies by a reader more or less up-to-date with the contemporary literary production of Rumania. He persistently keeps from considering himself a critic, because he does not find any didactic qualities within himself, nor a certain dogmatism, without which, it seems, there can be no critic."

Granted their timeliness and immediate scope, many of the items contain, nevertheless, a permanent element: it is the sincerity with which he interprets the traditional as well as the new and the experimental. It is with real delight that one reads these very attractive and instructive criticisms of this well-versed authority in the field of contemporary Rumanian literature.

LEON FERARU

LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY

ROMANCE LANGUAGE CLASS-TEXTS

M. Romera-Navarro, *Historia de la Literatura Española*, Boston, Heath & Co., 1928, 701 pp.

Histories of Spanish literature have frequently tended to become catalogues—interesting and valuable, no doubt,—but wrestling in vain with multitudinous fact and forever accumulating detail. Such books readily become expanded into voluminous "tablas cronológicas" as it were, all bristling with dates. Others again have discarded such scientific paraphernalia, and have attempted to replace literary history by some "páginas escogidas"—usually selected with all the taste that their predecessors had decreed for them.

Between the arid cliffs of the specialist on the one hand and the flowery marshland of the dilettante on the other Romera-Navarro here attempts to steer a middle course. No doubt, warnings will be sounded from both the sides he avoided. To the professional, this history may well seem too "peptonized" for easy digestion. The outlines of plots and select passages culled from outstanding authors may well seem a sacrilegious diversion to the seriousness of literary history, and a hindrance to

the reading of the originals. On the other hand, the amiable dilettanti may well feel their enthusiasm cooled by a few dozen scholarly references at the end of the chapters and a lack of superlatives in the text.

Yet the plan of Romera-Navarro should not be rejected *a priori*. Our mental habits run along the lines on which the book was planned. When one keeps in mind the needs of the student, and particularly of the American student, he will find the survey eminently suited for his special requirements. It combines quite exacting scholarship, attempts to incorporate the accepted results of more recent investigation, and presents opinions quite unbiased.

From a scholarly point of view, and according to one's personal preferences, one could require the author to stress one or another aspect. I personally should have preferred a greater precision in, and a more personal interpretation of, some of the accepted generalities that he guardedly repeats. For example, he could have discussed the *Mocedades del Cid* of Guillén de Castro from the point of view of the evolution of the character through history, legend and literature. In suggesting (p. 363) that the leper episode is introduced, in spite of its irrelevance in the plot, in order to "realzar bellamente el carácter del protagonista," he could have added that Guillén de Castro was following the well-established tradition of the *romances*, and was not guided only by aesthetic or psychological considerations. Similarly, the numerous recent articles on the *Abencerraje* story, especially those by Mérimée in the *Bulletin Hispanique*, disprove the statement that the "única versión conocida es la *Historia del Abencerraje* . . . que se halla en el *Inventario* (1565) de Antonio de Villegas" and the insertion in the *Diana* of Montemayor. Other and earlier versions are known in novel form as well as in ballads. One might also regret the unsympathetic attitude towards the more complex and inaccessible masterpieces of Góngora, as well as the repetition of the error that the work of the *Cisne* is neatly divided into two parts, the simple and the obscure; that the first part is the height of excellence of all Spanish lyrics; and the second the curse of mad poetasters. It is all the more astonishing to find this theory still upheld since one of the very critics who most emphatically refuted it—Miguel Artigas—is included in the bibliography of the chapter. However, on the whole, Romera-Navarro's guardedness of too personal views is to be commended.

Yet, there is one question of principle on which one may disagree without running the risk of stressing one's own prejudices, interests or specialties over much. It is the too coldly reserved attitude towards modern literature, which he shares with other literary historians. Romera-Navarro here evinces a great hesitancy, and speaks far more vaguely of the recent authors, justifying his attitude by declaring that the ultimate judgment on modern works has not yet been passed, and that we have not yet the perspective necessary to appraise these works at their value. One is inclined to suspect that this timidity is caused either by lack of example from which to glean opinions, or else through an unsympathetic attitude toward newer forms and innovations. Yet it is less easy to understand Romera-Navarro's hesitant attitude since he wrote his doctoral dissertation on Unamuno, and has shown a wide understanding of modern Spanish literature. Perhaps he allowed himself to be guided too closely by precedent, and feared to enter a field in which his personal views would of necessity have to play a more aggressive role. It is to be hoped that in the second edition of this work he will embody more affirmatively his views on the recent literature of Spain, and will not wait too patiently for the "Spirit of the Ages" to make a judicial decision as to the future hall of fame.

This volume is a valuable asset for survey classes. There exists no other literary history so practical, and in the main so accurate, and none which is so constructed as

to bear always in mind the needs of the beginning student and the uninitiated. It guides them to the more accessible sources for further study; it presents a picture of Spanish literature that is, at the same time, full and animated, documented and readable. And that alone is an achievement.

T. B. Rudmose-Brown, *A Book of French Verse. From Hugo to Larbaud*. Oxford University Press, 1928, xxiv + 128 pp.

Besides an excellent selection from modern verse this booklet furnishes an introduction about *The Structure of French Verse*, which will go far in elucidating French so-called "free verse" to the student. Professor Rudmose-Brown studies briefly the metrical tendencies of recent poetry,—but objectively, and without being drawn into the numerous battles which the progressive "renewal of form" of the last half century still stirs up. Paul Claudel, Paul Valéry, Lautréamont, Paul Morand and Jules Supervielle are not represented in this Anthology, because their work is "too difficult or otherwise unsuitable for school use"—but Rimbaud, Mallarmé, de Gourmont, Verhaeren, G. Apollinaire, Valéry Larbaud are quite adequately represented. In general, a stimulating booklet which will render service in the teaching of the modern poetry of France—a knowledge of which is so fundamental for the understanding of modern poetry in general.

Joseph W. Barlow, *Fundamentals of Spanish*, N. Y., Knopf, 1929, xiii + 272 pp.

This book will undoubtedly have the success it deserves. It offers several novel features which make it a valuable asset in the teaching of grammar and composition. The Spanish, natural and idiomatic from the start, never becomes too difficult to bridge the gap between the native tongue of the student and the language he wants to acquire. In this respect it improves considerably upon the artificial and hypothetical sentences so frequently piled up only to exemplify grammar rules and exceptions. Each lesson centers around some story or anecdote; some present a lively sketch of intimate domestic life—the *patio*, the servants, etc.; others again depict the popular customs—the bullfight, the sale of lottery tickets, the café, etc.; whereas the more advanced lessons retell episodes from the masterpieces: the flogging of Andrés by his master, Juan Haldudo el Rico, in *Don Quijote*, the snake episode in *Lazarillo*, a summary of the *Abencerraje*, of *El Trovador*, etc. This wide variety of subjects—customs, history and literature—offers, within its small compass, a vista of Spanish culture and civilization. At last an elementary grammar has dared to deviate from the dogma that its material should be simplistic, not to say infantile. This book presents reading matter stimulating enough in subject to cater to the intellectual interests of high school and college students, without discouraging them with insuperable linguistic difficulties.

But the fact that a good deal of stress is laid on the subject matter does not prevent the principles of grammar from being expounded with rare thoroughness. The rules are simplified and the student is repeatedly drilled in them—so repeatedly in fact, that under the guidance of a good teacher, the essentials of the language will unavoidably be mastered even by the most recalcitrant. The review lessons do not merely afford a mechanical repetition of these points of grammar—they are built around a new story in which the student reapplies the same principles from a different angle. The suggestive illustrations also form an integral part of the work. With them before his eyes, the student can develop his aptitude for free composition and thus gauge his own accomplishments in the language. The value of this grammar is further enhanced by the introductory lessons on pronunciation which, from the start,

bring the student in contact with the sound of the living language and prepares him early for classes where Spanish only is used.

This volume will especially interest teachers as a grammar which embodies the more recent contributions of pedagogy, and which nevertheless does not abandon the solid foundations laid by the teaching experience of many years. Its merit consists in the fact that it is novel without breaking away from tradition and without sacrificing to "fads"; that it combines the best features of direct method teaching, with that of literary reading, as well as with solid drill in fundamentals.

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

BARBARA MATULKA

E. Estaunié, *Tels qu'ils furent*, Edited by F. Ernst and H. Harvitt, D. C. Heath & Co., 289 pp.

It is not easy to find a contemporary French novel suitable for use as a text in High School and the first years of College. Either the subject is improper for any but the advanced class-room, as in the novels of Mauriac and Martin du Gard, or the involved manner of writing makes translation too difficult, as with Giraudoux and Proust. If the book is not ruled out for one of these reasons it is apt to be as completely undistinguished as the fiction of Henri Bordeaux.

The editors have shown good judgment in their choice of *Tels qu'ils furent*. There is nothing in the text that could shock the most sensitive. The style is on the whole sober and straightforward, with enough variety of structure and breadth of vocabulary to be profitable; and when difficulties do occur, whether they concern grammatical construction or historical allusion, they are thoroughly explained in the notes. Finally, the novel itself is not trivial. While there are a number of French novelists today more original and perhaps more interesting in form, more acute in analysis of character, there is none who writes with greater integrity than Estaunié. *Tels qu'ils furent*, moreover, as the editors point out in their preface, should be interesting to the student not only as a piece of fiction but as a mirror of French life in the 1860's and 70's.

Prof. Ernst and Miss Harvitt have shown the same tact in their editing as in their choice of a text. Their introduction contains none of the absurdly extravagant statements, more suggestive of publishers "blurbs" than of serious criticism, with which editors sometimes feel compelled to introduce their offerings. Its review of Estaunié's literary career is a piece of genuine constructive interpretation; the abridgment of the text is unobtrusive; the notes and exercises have been competently managed. The only thing one could wish improved is the quality of the illustrations which are even worse than those of the average text-book, but for which, I am sure, the editors are not to blame.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

S. ROGERS

INSTITUTO DE LAS ESPAÑAS

ON November 23d, 1929, under the auspices of the Instituto, the Intercollegiate Alliance of Spanish Clubs of New York City gave an entertainment and dance at the Casa Italiana as a contribution to the scholarship to be awarded by the Instituto for the Summer of 1930 to the best student of Spanish in the colleges of New York City. The recipient of the scholarship will be a member of the Instituto's tour, conducted by Professor William M. Barlow, and will be able to attend, as in

the past, the Summer Session of the Centro de Estudios Históricos in Madrid.—Professor E. Allison Peers of the University of Liverpool, Visiting Professor of Comparative Literature at Columbia University and official lecturer of the Instituto for the current academic year, gave, during November, 1929, a most interesting series of five lectures on "The Catalan Renaissance." The originality and learning of the distinguished English scholar aroused keen interest.—On Friday, December 13th, 1929, an evening of Spanish music was presented by the Instituto de las Españas' Chorus. On this occasion the chorus was ably assisted by Miss Mirrha Alhambra, musical director; Josefina Aguilar, soprano; Orpha Keen, soprano; Sra. de Barbazan and Sta. de Pereda, comédiennes; Soledad Rodriguez, dancer; Fernando Varela, tenor; Francisco Agea, pianist; Alberto de Lima, dancer; Nilo Menendez, pianist; Sres. Blanc and Buenaga, comedians; Leandro Fernandez, dancer; and the Rondalla Usandizaga.—On December 16th, 1929, an event of exceptional interest was the reception in honor of "La Argentina," the world famous dancer. The speakers of the evening were Dr. Ángel del Río, the painter and writer Gabriel García Maroto, the poet Federico García Lorca, and Professor Federico de Onís. The well known Rondalla Usandizaga contributed to the evening's enjoyment with selections from Falla, Granados and Albéniz.—The annual luncheon of the General Executive Council of the Instituto took place in January, 1930, at the Faculty Club of Columbia University and was presided over by the Chairman, Professor de Onís, who announced the building of the Casa Hispánica.—The distinguished Chilean poetess and educator Gabriela Mistral has been appointed official lecturer of the Instituto for the year 1930-1931. Gabriela Mistral has been invited by Barnard College as Visiting Professor of Latin-American Literature for the academic year 1930-1931. Upon request she will also give, under the auspices of the Instituto, lectures in Universities and cultural centers. For the studies of Hispanic-American literature and culture, the visit of the Hispanic-American poetess will be of great value.—On Monday, February 10th, a reception was given in honor of Federico García Lorca, Spain's distinguished poet and dramatist, who delivered a lecture on "Tres modos de poesía."—On Friday, February 20th, Sr. Ignacio Sanchez Mejías, distinguished espada, novelist and playwright, delivered a lecture on "El Pase de la Muerte" (Entendimiento del Toreo).—Professor Catherine L. Haymaker of Adelphi College, as General Director of the Spanish Clubs, is affiliating with the Instituto all Spanish Clubs throughout the United States.—On Thursday, March 6th, at Town Hall, Andrés Segovia, the world famous Guitarist, gave the second recital for the endowment fund of the Instituto. The concert was held under the auspices of the Spanish Ambassador, Alejandro Padilla y Bell. During the intermission Hon. Ogden H. Hammond, former United States Ambassador to Spain, made a short address outlining the plans of the Instituto as a centre for the study of Spanish culture and to foster cultural relations between the United States and the Hispanic countries. Following the concert Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Sachs gave a reception at their home, 42 East 69th Street, for Andrés Segovia. The Marchesa Belmonte de la Vega Real was Chairman of the Committee on Arrangements. Among the patrons were: Mrs. Henry Martyn Alexander; Mrs. Barrett Andrews; Mrs. Vincent Astor; Mrs. Samuel S. Auchincloss; Mrs. Hugh D. Auchincloss; Mrs. Stephen Birch; Mr. Lawrence Smith-Butler; Mrs. Nicholas Murray Butler; Mrs. Gordon Knox Bell; Mrs. Alexander Biddle; Mrs. James A. Burden; Miss Lucrezia Bori; Mrs. Juan M. Ceballos; Mrs. Elbridge Gerry Chadwick; Mrs. Harris R. Childs; Mrs. J. Sergeant Cram; Mrs. Richard M. Colgate; Mrs. George Eustis Corcoran; Mr. James B. Cushman; Mrs. Walter Damrosch; Mrs. Marius de Brabant; Lady

Duveen; Mrs. William B. Franklin; Mr. John A. Gade; Mrs. John A. Gade; Mr. James W. Gerard; Mrs. Charles E. Greenough; Mrs. Charles S. Guggenheimer; Mr. Ogden H. Hammond; Mrs. Ogden H. Hammond; Miss Malvina Hoffman; Mrs. Christian R. Holmes; Mrs. Henry R. Hoyt; Mrs. Herman Irion; Mrs. Otto H. Kahn; Mrs. Joseph J. Kerrigan; Mrs. Paul Kochanski; Mrs. Adolf Ladenburg; Mrs. Robert Malcom Littlejohn; Mr. Clarence H. Mackay; Mrs. Edward Purcell Mellon; Countess Mercati; Mrs. Clarence G. Michalis; Mrs. Charles E. Mitchell; Mrs. Victor Morawetz; Mrs. James B. Murphy; Mrs. Henry Fairfield Osborn; Mr. Percy Pyne, 2d; Mrs. Moses Taylor Pyne; Mrs. Gordon S. Rentschler; Mrs. Kermit Roosevelt; Mrs. Charles Cary Rumsey; Miss Marie Russell; Mrs. Arthur Ryle; Mrs. Arthur Sachs; Mrs. George B. Salisbury; Miss Louise Sands; Miss Antoinette E. Schulte; Mrs. Arthur H. Scribner; Mrs. Charles H. Sherrill; Mrs. Joyce Shonnard; Mrs. Frederick W. Steinway; Mrs. Theodore Steinway; Mrs. Bernard L. Tim; Mrs. Cornelius Vanderbilt; Mrs. Malcom Whitman; Miss Mary Hoyt Wiborg; Mrs. R. Thornton Wilson; Mr. Louis Wiley; Mrs. Willis D. Wood; Mr. Arthur Williams; Mrs. J. Enrique Zanetti.

R. A. BECERRA

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

IN MEMORIAM: ADOLPHE COHN

ADOLPHE COHN, noted Franco-American educator, died in Paris on Tuesday, February 11, after a brief illness.

Professor Cohn was born in Paris on May 29, 1851, the eldest son of Albert and Mathilde (Lowengard) Cohn. After studying with private tutors he entered the University of Paris, from which he received the degree of *Bachelier ès Lettres* in 1868. During the Franco-Prussian War he served as volunteer in the French army from July, 1870, to February, 1871, after the close of which he returned to his studies in the University, where he received in 1873 the degree of *Bachelier en Droit*, and the following year that of *Archiviste Paléographe* from the *Ecole Nationale de Chartes*.

Professor Cohn came to the United States in 1875. After having engaged in the private teaching of French for seven years he was appointed Tutor in French at Columbia College in 1882, which title was changed the following year to Instructor. For the next seven years (1884-91) he was Instructor and Assistant Professor of French at Harvard University, where his talents as a teacher were highly appreciated by Professor Ferdinand Bôcher, a distinguished pioneer in the instruction of French in the United States. On April 6, 1887, Professor Cohn married Marian Loys Wright, a well-known artist of Cambridge, Mass., who died the following year (Feb. 19, 1888).

He returned to Columbia University in 1891 as Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures, in which capacity he continued until his retirement in 1916. With the devoted cooperation of Henry Alfred Todd, Professor of Romance Philology, and of Carlo Leonardo Speranza, Professor of Italian, he developed instruction in the Romance languages at Columbia and counted among his pupils some of the leading scholars and writers of America, at the present time.

Professor Cohn was one of the founders of the *Alliance Française* in the United States, becoming its first President, and was later given the title of Honorary President, which he held until his death. He was also one of the founders, as well as a member throughout his life, of the Modern Language Association of America, while the French and Italian governments conferred on him the honors of *Officier de la*

Légion d'Honneur and Cavaliere della Corona d'Italia. On June 4, 1904, he married Madeleine Merlin of New York, who with two sons (one by his first marriage) and a daughter survive him.

Though Professor Cohn was not a productive scholar his profound knowledge of his specialties—French classical drama of the seventeenth century and Voltaire—enabled him to direct many interesting researches as well as to render valuable services to his colleagues. An enthusiastic and inspiring lecturer and teacher, he devoted his efforts mainly to the improvement of class-texts, so important forty years ago. Among his publications we may note an edition of Le Sage's *Gil Blas*, issued in 1889 in cooperation with the late Professor R. Sanderson of Yale University; in 1897, Voltaire's *Prose*, with Professor B. D. Woodward, now retired, of Columbia University; and the edition of Montaigne in *French Classics for English Readers*, in 1907. He also inaugurated, as first editor, the *Silver Series of Modern Language Text Books*, and created, in cooperation with his pupil, Professor C. H. Page, then of Columbia University and more recently President of the Poetry Society of America, the well-known series of *French Classics for English Readers*. Finally, during the World War, he was a fearless and ardent champion of the French cause, and translated into French James M. Beck's *War and Humanity*.

With the cooperation of his colleagues, Professor Cohn was instrumental in bringing to Columbia University the first foreign lecturers in the Romance field,—among whom may be mentioned Ferdinand Brunetière, Joseph Bédier, Gustave Lanson, James Fitzmaurice-Kelly, Ramón Menéndez Pidal and Guglielmo Ferrero. Out of this movement he and his colleagues later developed the first Visiting Professorships in French Literature at Columbia University, as well as the Maison Française, the first cultural centre to be established in the United States. Indeed, all Romance scholars in the United States owe a debt of gratitude to such worthy pioneers as Professor Cohn, through whose indefatigable efforts instruction in the Romance tongues is now definitely established in the curricula of our educational institutions. This profound tribute we pay to his memory.

J. L. G.

VARIA

EDUCATIONAL AND BIBLIOGRAPHIC.—Director R. Roland-Marcel, of the Bibliothèque Nationale, announced on March 5 that many priceless manuscripts of the great library are in danger of destruction from deterioration for lack of funds for their proper care. He points out that as the fund available for binding and repairs to books and manuscripts amounts to \$5,000 annually, only 8,000 volumes could be repaired in 1928, whereas in 1913 more than 25,000 volumes were rebound at the same cost. Consequently, it has been necessary to withdraw from circulation a large number of the Collections of sixteenth and seventeenth century manuscripts and books because of their worn condition. It is therefore apparent that the plan recently formulated by Professor C. D. Zdanowicz, of creating an American Section of the Société des Amis de la Bibliothèque Nationale, is very à propos. Among those who have expressed approval of the idea are J. D. M. Ford (Harvard), Dean Christian Gauss (Princeton), J. L. Gerig and G. L. van Roosbroeck (Columbia), H. C. Lancaster (Johns Hopkins), Wm. A. Nitze (Chicago), Albert Schinz (Pennsylvania), Horatio Smith (Brown), Bert Young (Indiana), Dean Geoffrey Atkinson (Amherst), Dean Geo. N. Henning (George Washington University), R. P. Jameson (Oberlin), Barry

Cerf (Reed College), Dr. Paul Van Dyke (Director of the American University Union at Paris in 1928-29), and many others. Annual membership in the American Section is fixed at \$2.00; life membership at \$30.00; and there is still another grade of membership known as *Membre donateur*. All those who have profited in the past from the valuable services rendered by this great institution or who feel an interest in this most worthy cause are urged therefore to send contributions to Professor Casimir D. Zdanowicz, University of Wisconsin, Madison.—The Linguistic Institute, whose coming Summer Session will be held at the College of the City of New York from July 7 to August 15, requests that the following courses be announced as of particular interest to the readers of the *ROMANIC REVIEW*: Prof. H. B. Richardson, of Yale University, "The Classical Element in English: An introduction to the phonology of Vulgar Latin and Old French in so far as is necessary to trace the passage of Latin vocabulary into English through French"; Prof. H. F. Muller, of Columbia, "Vulgar Latin: A search in the texts for the advent of the linguistic phenomena which were to bring about the transformation of Latin into Romance"; Dr. Winifred Sturdevant, of Columbia, "Old French: An introductory course with especial attention to questions of phonology and word history"; Prof. H. B. Richardson, "Old Spanish: A study of Spanish historical grammar, with readings from the *Cid* and Juan Ruiz"; and Prof. J. L. Gerig, of Columbia, "Old and Middle Irish: Grammar and reading of texts." A feature of the session will be the presence of Prof. J. Marouzeau of the Sorbonne, who will lecture on topics connected with Latin grammar. Announcements of the session may be obtained upon request from Prof. E. H. Sturtevant, Director, Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn. It is interesting to note that of the 37 registrants in the courses of the 1929 session, "eighteen already held the Ph.D. degree." The Institute has also secured the establishment of four lectureships: The Germanistic Society Lectureship in Old High German; the Lafrentz Lectureship in Old Frisian and Old Saxon; the Blum Lectureship which is to be held by a distinguished French scholar; and the Vogelstein Lectureship in Semitic Languages.—Professor Paul Van Tieghem, General Secretary of the Commission Internationale d'Histoire Littéraire Moderne, which has its headquarters at 47, Boulevard Garibaldi, Paris, announces that the Commission is preparing a *Répertoire littéraire chronologique international* and requests the cooperation of American scholars in this important undertaking.—The Facsimile Text Society has recently been organized with Professor Frank A. Patterson, of the English Department of Columbia University, as Executive Officer. Among the works announced for reproduction which, it may be added, must be of a character as to interest English scholars, are the French translation (1578) of Machiavelli's *Prince*; philosophical works of Geulincz, Georgius Trapezuntius, Jacob Zabarella, Nicholas of Cusa; and the *Speculum Naturale* (1485), by Vincent of Beauvais. Works in Spanish and French will be selected by Program Committees to be formed by Professors J. P. W. Crawford and J. L. Gerig. Suggestions from readers of the *ROMANIC REVIEW* will be welcomed.—Princeton University announced recently that André Maurois, author of *Ariel*, *Byron*, etc., will be the first incumbent of the M. H. Pyne Lectureship in French Literature, and that he will be succeeded in Feb., 1931, by Prof. Paul Laumonier of the University of Bordeaux. Foreign professors at present in America include Dr. Walter Starkie, Professor of Romance Languages at Trinity College, Dublin, and Visiting Professor at the University of Madrid, who delivered a series of lectures at the University of Chicago during the spring; Professor Corrado Gini, President of the Central Bureau of Statistics at Rome, who lectured on sociological subjects at the University of Minnesota; and Miss Eileen Power, Lecturer in the University of

London, who lectured on Medieval History at Barnard College. Rector A. Lupatelli, of the University of Perugia, and Dean P. E. Pavalini, of the University of Florence, attended in February the 200th anniversary celebration of the founding of the University of Havana.—The American House, erected in the Cité Universitaire of the University of Paris, was formally dedicated with fitting ceremonies on April 28. Press dispatches describe it as an imposing six-story brown-brick building with white marble trimmings. It is designed to house 260 college students and is also equipped with studio accommodations for students of art and music. As already announced in these pages (Cf. *ROMANIC REVIEW*, XX, 1929, p. 298), rooms have been donated by sixteen American universities and colleges. And now the Committee on the Columbia Room, formed last year, announces that sufficient funds have been obtained to endow two Columbia rooms. The inaugurators of the movement which resulted in the raising of nearly \$500,000 for the construction of the American House were the late Ambassador Herrick, who laid the cornerstone of the building on April 30, 1928, and Dr. and Mrs. Homer Gage, of Worcester, Mass.—The Duke of Alba, Spain's new Minister of Education, is reported by the *New York Times* of Feb. 4, as saying that he would "endeavor to pattern the new city university after American universities, which I have seen and admire as I do all American educational institutions."—The *New York Times*, of February 22, contained a long article, with reproductions, recounting a purchase by Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach of 20,000 documents and letters, "constituting virtually a day-by-day record of the British Army's struggle against the American colonists," from the Royal Institution of Great Britain. "Portraying the French side of the American Revolution," according to the *Times*, "are a series of documents of Comte d'Estaing, Marquis de Lafayette, Comte de Rochambeau (in one of which he says he supplied Cornwallis with money when he was a prisoner of George Washington), and many dealing with the naval battles in which the French took an active part."—The French Department of Hunter College, New York, held during the week of April 7 an exhibition of French manuscripts and books in the college library. The exhibition included also stamps, medals, baskets, colored plates of old costumes and paintings by Prof. Paul Cru, a member of the faculty.—An autograph manuscript of the French national anthem, the "Marseillaise," bearing the signature of the composer, Rouget de l'Isle, was sold at Sotheby's in London, on February 17, for \$850. Messrs. Maggs, purchasers of the manuscript, stated that it was recently discovered among the family papers of a Toulouse merchant.—The *New York Times* of March 27 published an interesting article on the Société de Géographie de Paris, which was founded in 1821 and had as its first president the great astronomer Laplace. "Its library contains," according to the *Times*, "more than 300,000 volumes, 100,000 maps and 150,000 photographs, not to mention numerous atlases, periodicals, negatives and portraits."—In advocating the discontinuance of the modern foreign language requirement for the Ph.D. degree, G. H. Betts and R. A. Kent make the following extraordinary statement in *Northwestern University Contribution to Education* (Bloomington, Ill.): "Furthermore, according to testimony of leading scholars in many fields, foreign scholarship has nothing to contribute to one who seeks high specialization in certain lines of scholarly endeavor" (p. 1). On the other hand, A. E. Sproul maintains, in a long article in the *New York Times* of Jan. 24, that there is no reason why an educated man "should not have a speaking knowledge of at least two of the four chief modern European languages." He feels that the choice of the first language should "lie between English and French, with the probabilities in favor of the former," for, as he states, the

English language, "notably through the wide extension of the motion picture and the radio, is steadily gaining in currency all over the earth."—The contribution of F. Ciarlantini on "The Italian Language in the United States" to the March issue of *Atlantica* (New York) contains on p. 16 various quotations from A. Livingston's "La Merica Sanemagogna," which appeared in the *ROMANIC REVIEW* in 1918 (IX, pp. 206-226).—The *News Letter*, issued by the Italian Historical Society in Feb. 21, contains a résumé of the activities of the Society during the autumn and winter. Among the most interesting sections are the monthly dinners at which the speakers were S. S. McClure, Prof. G. Prezzolini, Dr. James J. Walsh, Miss Fredericka Blankner, Judge John J. Freschi, Mrs. Alexander M. Hadden, Edward Corsi and Justice Wm. Harmon Black; lecture tours arranged for former Congressman M. W. Howard, Miss Blankner, Rev. Dr. Samuel W. Irwin, and H. L. Varney; radio talks; new chapters; information service, etc. Since its establishment in 1927, the Society has issued the following publications: H. R. Marraro, *Nationalism in Italian Education*; Count G. Volpi and Prof. B. Stringher, *The Financial Reconstruction of Italy*; Dr. A. Pennachio, *The Corporate State* (translated into Italian, 1929); Willis J. Abbot, *Mussolini Tells Why He Prefers Fascism to Parliamentary Democracy for Italy*; H. W. Schneider, *Italy Incorporated (The Guild Organization of the Italian People)*; Rev. Dr. Samuel W. Irwin, *Through the Italian Tyrol*; James P. Roe, *Fascism, Masonry and the Vatican in Italy*; H. L. Varney, *The Outlook for Democracy in Italy*; and, in cooperation with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Sen. A. Rocco, *The Political Doctrine of Fascism*, and Count G. Volpi, *Italy's Financial Policy*. For information regarding the Society, address Harold Lord Varney, Manager, 113 West 42d Street, New York City.—The *New York Times*, of Feb. 21 and March 16, contained accounts of the formation of a Committee for the purpose of erecting a Spanish Casita at Barnard College, which will serve to house those students who wish to live in a Spanish atmosphere. The Committee, headed by Hernand Behn, Chairman, and Clarence H. Mackay, Treasurer, is seeking a fund of \$50,000 to found the house. Professor Carolina Marcial Dorado is the Faculty representative on the Committee.—The American Legion is conducting under the auspices of the Phare de France a school for children of the members of the Paris Post. According to press dispatches of March 5, the official language of the school is French, except the Thursday holiday, which is devoted to English.—The International School of Vedic and Allied Research elected recently the following members to the Executive Council of its American Section: Edward Capps, Professor of Classics, Princeton University, and Director of the Division of Humanities, Rockefeller Foundation; John Dewey, Professor of Philosophy, Columbia University; John H. Finley, formerly President of the College of the City of New York, Associate Editor of the *New York Times*; J. L. Gerig, Professor of Celtic, Columbia University; S. L. Joshi, Professor of Comparative Religion and Hindu Philosophy, Dartmouth College; K. F. Leidecker, Professor in the International School of Vedic and Allied Research; J. B. Pratt, Professor of Philosophy, Williams College; and E. R. A. Seligman, McVickar Professor of Political Economy, Columbia University. At the same time twenty members were elected to the Advisory Board, among whom was Prof. D. Bigongiari of Columbia University. The officers of the American Section of the School are President Charles R. Lanman, Emeritus Professor of Sanskrit of Harvard University; Vice-President, E. Washburn Hopkins, Emeritus Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology of Yale University; Dr. G. C. O. Haas, Secretary and Editor of Publications; and Director, Pandit J. C. Chatterji. The aims of the School include investigations into Indian influences in the Romance literatures. The

School has furthermore issued two numbers of a quarterly *Journal* published under the auspices of the All-India Committee and the Benares Centre, as well as of the American and British Sections. For further information regarding the School, address Dr. Geo. C. O. Haas, Secretary, Times Building, N. Y. City. Professors John Dewey and J. L. Gerig were guests of honor from the Faculty of Columbia University at the debate on India held before the Foreign Policy Association on February 15. The speakers were S. Ghose, formerly Professor of Physics in University College, Calcutta, and Edward Thompson, Lecturer in Bengali at Oxford.—The Guggenheim Memorial Foundation announced on March 23 the award of 85 fellowships, totaling more than \$200,000. Among the successful candidates are two contributors to recent issues of the *ROMANIC REVIEW*, viz. Prof. H. C. Berkowitz, who is to study Galdós and the importance of his contribution to Spanish life and letters; and Prof. H. M. Peyre, whose subject is "Louis Menard, a Frenchman of letters of the nineteenth century." Prof. F. C. Tarr, of Princeton, is to study "the origin and development of the *artículo de costumbres*," a type of Spanish newspaper sketch, while Jacques LeClercq, instructor in Columbia University, well known writer and translator, will do creative writing. Mrs. Mary M. Colum, of New Canaan, Conn., will write a study of contemporary American and French ideas in criticism. Dr. J. T. Lanning, of Duke University, who is among the five fellows who go to Mexico, will prepare "a study of the universities of the Hispanic colonies, with special reference to their place in the development of the Hispanic mind and culture and in the preliminaries of the wars of independence." In the History of Fine Arts, Prof. C. Kennedy, of Smith College, is to prepare "a study in Italy of the Renaissance sculptor, Desiderio da Settignano," while Mrs. Ruth W. Kennedy will complete "a monograph on the Florentine painter, Alesso Baldovinetti." Prof. K. J. Conant of Harvard is to devote himself to "the making of restoration drawings of the Abbey Church of Cluny, France." As may be seen from the above, the awards for studies in Romance literature and philology are very limited in number. It is to be hoped that this is not due to any change of policy on the part of the Foundation.—The Social Science Research Council awarded, on March 8, twenty-two fellowships, with an aggregate value of \$80,000, for the year 1930-31. Among the successful candidates are H. M. Ehrmann, of the University of Michigan, who is to study "Italian foreign policy from 1882 to 1915, with reference to the entrance of Italy into the World War," and A. P. Nasatir, of California State College, whose subject of research is "Spain in the Mississippi Valley."—According to press dispatches of February 11, the famous Mudie's Library in New Oxford Street, London, is soon to be transferred to Kingsway. "For seventy years," says the *New York Times*, "the stuccoed Regency building near the British Museum has been a bookreaders' Mecca. Starting from a collection of 5,000 books, the library now includes almost a million."

NECROLOGY.—Dr. Hans Froelicher, acting president of Goucher College, died suddenly in Baltimore on January 12, in his 63d year. He was born in Switzerland of a distinguished family of professors and painters and had been on the faculty of Goucher College since 1888 where he taught French, German and the history of art.—Frederick Ernest Libby, former Assistant Commissioner of Education of Porto Rico, died at Melrose, Mass., on January 24 at the age of 53. Having been for ten years director of elementary schools in the Republic of Panama, he was, at the time of his death, in charge of all Panamanian students in the United States.—Mme Anatole France died at Villa Said, Paris, on January 24 at the age of 58. Née Emma La Prévotte, she lived at St. Louis, Mo., from her tenth year to her twenty-second, and

never lost her interest in American affairs. Five brothers and a sister survive her in Los Angeles.—Dom André Mocquereau, the eminent Benedictine liturgical scholar, died at the Monastery of Solesmes, now on the Isle of Wight, on January 25 in his 80th year. He was author and editor of the *Paléographie musicale* (13 vols.), *L'Art Grégorien*, and other works. Some years ago there was founded in his honor in the United States the Dom Mocquereau Schola Cantorum Foundation, Inc.—Maurice Neumont, the painter, died in Paris on February 11 at the age of 64. He was associated with Willette and Forain in founding the Salon des Humoristes.—Charles Herbert Moore, emeritus Professor of Art at Harvard University, died in Hampshire, England, on February 17 in his 90th year. He was the author of several works on medieval architecture.—Frederick B. Kaye, Professor of English at Northwestern University, died at Boston on February 28 in the 38th year of his age. He was one of the four American members of the Commission Internationale d'Histoire Littéraire Moderne.—Antonio Beltramelli, noted novelist and member of the Royal Academy of Italy, died at Rome on March 15, aged 55. Besides contributing reviews on political and literary subjects, he was author of a *Life of Premier Mussolini*.—Karl Pietsch, noted Spanish scholar and emeritus Professor of Romance Philology at the University of Chicago, died on April 1 in his 71st year. Born in Germany, Professor Pietsch came to Chicago in 1894, where, for a while, he was assistant librarian at the Newberry Library. Since 1896 he had been a member of the Faculty of the University of Chicago. A year ago he was awarded a special diploma by the University of Halle in recognition of his work. His numerous publications were marked by a sound philological scholarship, as is evidenced by his *Spanish Grail Fragments*, one of his best known recent books.

DRAMA.—On February 21 Princeton University formally inaugurated the new McCarter Theatre, costing more than \$450,000. Among the speakers at the dedication ceremonies was Prof. D. C. Stuart, to whom President Hibben referred as "both the prophet and the apostle of this enterprise." In addition to his courses in dramatic and French literature Dr. Stuart has been director of the Triangle Club, the university dramatic organization, for the past ten years.—On March 12 Sacha Guitry, the actor and dramatist, presented, at the Franco-American Charity Fête in Paris, his sketch reconstituting the reception given at Mount Vernon in 1782 by General Washington to thank General Lafayette and the French army for their services rendered to the American colonies in the War of Independence. Among the 100 or more professionals and amateurs who took part in the sketch was Yvonne Printemps, actress wife of the dramatist, who sang old songs at the entertainment provided by Washington for his guests.—On February 2, Firmin Gémier, the famous actor, resigned, because of ill health, the directorship of the French State theatre Odéon. His successor is Paul Abram, who has been co-director. M. Gémier, who was 60 years old on February 13, first became famous as a character actor at the old Théâtre Antoine. Upon the invitation of Charles E. Hughes, then Secretary of State, M. Gémier visited the United States and Canada with his company in 1924.—When a distinguished philologist like M. Ferdinand Brunot of the Sorbonne wanders so far afield as to discuss American motion pictures, one may expect conclusions not only unusual but at the same time not as soundly built as those derived from philological data. Quoting from an interview published in the *Paris-Soir*, the *New York Times*, of March 23, finds the eminent scholar to be a dyed-in-the-wool pessimist. "It is a struggle between two forces, financial and intellectual," M. Brunot is quoted as saying, "the latter being conclusively dominated today by the former. Our great France is caught between

two opposite poles, America and Russia." Remarking further that France is "the slave of money power," he adds: "America imposes its films on us just as she takes from us our works of art and our historic châteaux." In answer to the question, "Does not France turn more and more toward America when it comes to defraying the expenses of our colleges?", M. Brunot replies: "To be sure, the intellectual doesn't want to admit defeat, and strives to stem the flood which drives him toward oblivion; but, instantly, obscure forces and sinister interests surge forth—and these, at bottom, are 'their' forces and 'their' interests." The only escape from American scenarios appears to be, in M. Brunot's opinion, in a collaboration with "nations of forceful intellect and a sufficiently artistic background," the restrictive adjectives, according to the *Times*, evidently excluding the United States. Since the ROMANIC REVIEW has of late received several subscriptions from Russia, it is quite possible that this may be sufficient evidence for M. Brunot to conclude that American scholarship is being dominated by the "sinister forces" of the Soviet Government.—Recent plays that have been well received in Paris, according to Philip Carr, writing in the *New York Times*, include: Henri Jeanson's *Amis comme avant*, a play about the nagging wife heretofore treated by Molière, Courteline and Henri Becque; *Le Pêché*, a sombre peasant tragedy of Rumania by the young Rumanian Jew Adolphe Orna, who died suddenly in 1925; *La fin du monde*, also by a Rumanian poet, which deals with the sudden sincerity that some persons "may be supposed to show when they think that their end is at hand"; *L'Homme que j'ai tué*, by Maurice Rostand, which is based on a short story written by the author in 1921, and which the critic finds to be lacking in artistic qualities, notwithstanding the author's passionate moral aversion for war; *Pardon, Madame*, by Romain Coolus and André Rivoire, a play about "a politician who spends all his official day in love-making"; *Juliette, ou la clé des songes*, a "pièce de début" by Georges Neveux, which is devoted to a dreamland whose inhabitants, with one exception, are entirely devoid of memory; and Pirandello's *La Vie que je t'ai donnée*, a "deeply moving excursion into the borderland between a real and an imagined world," which was very successful in spite of the fact that "the Pirandello fashion is no longer at its height in France."—The Comédie Française is now thinking of making a change in its statutes so that a play, not originally produced by it, may be added to its repertory seven (instead of fifteen) years after its original production. Philip Carr, writing in the *New York Times* of March 2, points out that the repertory of the Comédie is divided into three categories: First, the classics, "which have long since gone out of copyright and which anybody may produce"; secondly, those not yet out of copyright and which "may or may not have originally been produced by the Comédie"; and thirdly, new plays whose authors submit them for original production at the Comédie, regardless of tempting offers elsewhere. Because of the restrictions imposed upon them in the last two categories, the authorities of the Comédie are often unable to present even those plays representing the best of dramatic production of twenty or thirty years ago. It is felt, therefore, that "the National Theatre should have an unrestricted option upon any play that is a few years old."—Gaston Baty has retired from the management of the beautiful Pigalle Theatre, recently constructed in Paris by Henri de Rothschild. Consequently, the donor, thoroughly discouraged by this failure, is thinking of abandoning his original idea of devoting his magnificently equipped playhouse to dramatic art, and, according to Philip Carr in the *Times* of March 30, "is proposing to turn it over to spectacular comic opera or even to the cinematograph."—During the month of February, according to the *New York Times*, Paris witnessed a revival of interest in Shakespeare.

The events which brought this about included presentations of a translation of *The Tempest* by Guy de Pourtalès, of a highly vernacular French version of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and of the richly colored interpretation of *The Merchant of Venice*, given at the Odéon. At the same time the Comtesse de Chambrun issued a volume on *Hamlet*.—In a long article on the "Opera Crisis in Italy" in the *New York Times* of Jan. 19, Guido M. Gatti, writing from Milan, explains that the indifference of the Italian public to this artistic form is due not only to its ever growing appreciation of pure music, but also to the fact that in opera "there has arisen no genius capable of infusing new life into it." Likewise recent productions have been far from brilliant from the artistic point of view. Hence Pietro Mascagni, the new Academician, laments that he is unable "to find an impresario who would dare to revive one of the fourteen operas, with the exception of *Cavalleria*, written by him."

LITERATURE.—The centenary of the première of Hugo's *Hernani* was inaugurated in Paris by a gala presentation of the famous play at the Théâtre Français on February 25. This was followed a few days later by ceremonies before the tomb of the author in the Pantheon of Paris. Likewise the centenary of the birth of the great historian, Fustel de Coulanges, was commemorated at ceremonies held at the Sorbonne on March 20 in the presence of President Doumergue and Pierre Marraud, Minister of Public Instruction. On April 13, a monument was dedicated to Edmond Rostand in his native city of Marseilles. The speakers included Maurice Donnay of the Académie Française and Gaston Rageot, President of the Society of Men of Letters. Speaking of monuments, it may be of interest to note that those of Jules Simon and Camille Saint-Saëns were removed during March from the places they occupied in the streets of Paris.—During the month of April, Italy began to celebrate the 2000th anniversary of the birth of Virgil. Ceremonies are to be held at Mantua, where the poet was born; at Naples, where he was buried; and at Rome, where he spent most of his life. However, a very interesting controversy has been started in Italian intellectual circles by Professor Pio Emanuelli, Director of the Vatican Astronomical Observatory, who holds that the anniversary is not due until 1931.—The brilliant French author, Paul Morand, whose recent work on New York has met with unusual success in France, again startled the intelligentsia by informing the American Club of Paris on February 27 that New York has become a centre of culture. But the *New York Times*, of March 2, observes editorially that "the audience at home remains unmoved, except in the direction of Paris."—A recent survey of popular fiction in the United States revealed, according to the *New York Times*, that Dumas père is still "most in demand at the public libraries."—Prof. H. P. Thieme, of the University of Michigan, has contributed a very interesting study on "Rhythm" to the *Mélanges F. Baldensperger* (Paris, 1930).—The tendency of the younger generation to over-emphasize the literary value of current works may be seen in the recent vote of the senior class of Düsseldorf, Germany, with regard to their preferred author. E. M. Remarque, author of *All Quiet on the Western Front*, received 248 votes against 220 cast for Goethe and 181 for Schiller.

ART AND ARCHITECTURE.—In an address on Major Pierre Charles L'Enfant, delivered before the L'Enfant Memorial Association in Fraunces Tavern, New York, on Jan. 18, Ambassador Claudel compared the American capital city to Versailles. The meeting was held to arouse interest in the erection of a monument to L'Enfant on the Washington mall.—The Duc de Richelieu, who spends most of his time in New York, donated recently his splendid château and grounds of 1000 acres, in the town of Richelieu in Touraine to the University of Paris, to be used as a home for

retired professors and scientists, as well as a place to receive and entertain foreign educators who visit France.—The third exhibition held at the Museum of Modern Art in New York in February was entitled "Painting in Paris," since the collection consisted of the works of American artists, both young and old, who are living in the, French capital.—The exhibition of Italian art, called the greatest ever assembled, was closed in London on March 20 after being shown for almost three months. Among the 518,000 persons who visited the exhibition were 14,000 art teachers.—The French Government began to issue in March a new series of postage stamps containing engravings of the most famous monuments of the country. Thus, the twenty-franc stamp represents the Pont du Gard, near Avignon; the ten-franc stamp, the bridge at La Rochelle; and the five-franc stamp, Mont Saint-Michel.—Announcement was made from Philadelphia on February 13, that the collection of 191 pieces of fifteenth and sixteenth century Italian and French art assembled by the late Edmond Foulc of Paris, had been transferred to the Pennsylvania Museum of Art, and will become the Museum's permanent possession if the purchase price, exceeding 1,000,000, can be met by June 1. Among the most important items are bronzes by Bellano, Bertoldo, Adriano Fiorentino, and Sansovino, a "lit de justice" from the Château d'Argenteuil, a triple-seated stall from the Abbey of Langeac, and an alabaster choir-screen from the Château de Pugny. Marcel Aubert, curator of the Louvre, said: "There is nothing like the Foulc collection still in private hands today. Since we could not keep it in France, there is no place where I would rather see it than in your museum."—The Fogg Museum of Art of Cambridge, Mass., purchased on Feb. 7 a "Christ" by Botticelli from Prince Massimo of Rome. American public museums owning works by this artist are the following: Fogg Museum, (2); Metropolitan Museum (2); and Detroit Museum (1).—The James Elverson collection of fifty paintings consisting mainly of works of the Barbison school, as well as of Harnpignies, Bouguereau, Henner, etc., was sold at auction in New York on Jan. 30 for \$132,635. The five Corots brought the highest prices, ranging from \$8,000 to \$41,000.—A collection of 119 paintings from the estate of Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer was sold at auction in New York on April 10. The French canvases included works by David, Delacroix, Courbet, Décamps (8), Césanne and Manet, while Spain was represented by El Greco, Carreno de Miranda, Goya (2), and others. The highest prices paid for individual paintings were as follows: David (\$26,000); Césanne (\$24,000); Goya (\$21,000); El Greco (\$15,000). It will be remembered that the larger part of Mrs. Havemeyer's collection was bequeathed to the Metropolitan Museum of Art.—The City of Paris inaugurated in February in the Petit Palais a permanent exhibition of the work of humorists and caricaturists. It will contain works of Daumier, the father of French cartoonists, Gavarni, Willette, Forain, Sem, Léandre, Naudin and many others. This official recognition, inspired by the great success of the annual Salon des Humoristes, is acclaimed as the first of its kind in the history of art.—Gabriel Wells, of New York, presented recently to the Musée Carnavalet of Paris many mementos of Honoré de Balzac which had been obtained from the Balzac family in France.—Among the recent exhibitions of paintings that received universal praise from New York art critics was that of the works of Jan Matulka, held in April at the Rehn Gallery. It was characterised by the *New York Times*, of April 13, as "fascinating" and as "a gallant demonstration of exuberancy." Mr. Matulka's talents are shared by his sisters, Misses Barbara and Caroline Matulka.—According to the *New York Times* of March 23, C. H. Mackay of New York purchased recently from Prince Jacques de Broglie, Châtelain of the Château de Chaumont, one of the finest

Italian tapestries contained in its museum. The sum paid was said to be nearly \$1,000,000.—Gen. C. H. Sherrill announced on March 16 the plans of the sixth Summer Session of New York University's Art School in Paris. This school, which is directed by Prof. C. Chassé, awarded last year certificates of merit to 368 students out of an attendance of nearly 1,000.

MISCELLANEOUS.—The Institute of International Education announced recently thirty fellowship awards and nine appointments to "postes d'assistants," all for study in France during the academic year 1930-31. Among the nine fellowships of the American Field Service, carrying stipends of \$1400, were those given to M. Halperin, of Boston, who is completing a thesis on "Historiosophie chez les premiers romantiques en France," and to P. C. Snodgrass of Little Rock, Ark., who is to "continue critical studies in the later modern period of French literature."—The most important fête of this year, commemorating the fifth centenary of Joan of Arc, will be held at Compiègne on May 25-26 in honor of her entry into that town. Most of the old buildings are being transformed to assume a medieval appearance and more than 3,000 persons dressed in costumes of the period will take part in the procession.—Excavations made for the monument to be erected at Montfaucon, France, in memory of the American soldiers who fell in the battle of the Argonne Forest have revealed, according to the *New York Times* of April 7, vestiges of a fortress built in 1081 by Godefroy de Bouillon, Duke of Lorraine, who was the French leader in the first Crusade and was afterward crowned King of Jerusalem.—The Museum of French Art of New York held from April 9 to May 2 a loan exhibition of 200 items, consisting of relics, curios, portraits, autograph letters, etc., relating to General Lafayette.—The proposal of Gov. Roosevelt of New York to convert the grave of Baron de Steuben into a State memorial has aroused much discussion as to whether the particle "von" should not be used instead of "de." Accordingly, the New York Historical Society announced, on Feb. 16, that an investigation of letters from Washington, Jefferson and others addressed to the Revolutionary General as well as his own signature to his will, all of which are contained in the treasures of the Society, revealed an almost exclusive use of "de."—The Italians of New York placed, on Feb. 22, a bronze marker on the recently discovered tomb of Capt. Jos. Lametti, a veteran of the War of 1812, who is buried in the cemetery surrounding old St. Patrick's Cathedral in Prince Street.—In an address delivered before the France-America Society on Feb. 6, Ambassador Claudel said, in regard to progress in the mutual relations between France and the United States: "The greatest progress in this respect is in France. Your movies and talkies have soaked the French mind in American life, methods and manners. I see in this nothing but a good and healthy symptom. . . . The place in French life and culture formerly held by Spain and Italy, and in the nineteenth century by England, now belongs to America."—The Belgian Parliament voted, on Feb. 27, the first article of the new language law which provides for the conversion of the University of Ghent into an entirely Flemish institution of learning. It is hoped that this concession will settle amicably the bitter discussion centering about the language problem in Belgium, to which attention was called in the last issue of this journal (p. 97). The other state university, Liège, will be French-speaking, as are also Brussels and Louvain, which, however, are not governmental institutions. In an article entitled "Languages are Still a Live Issue in Europe" in the *New York Times* of Jan. 26, Harold Callendar discusses this question at length. According to M. Tesnière of the University of Strasbourg, "who," says Mr. Callendar, "has studied the subject exhaustively, 120 languages (exclusive of dialects) are now spoken in Europe. Nineteen of these tongues are spoken each by 5,000,000 people or more, while

thirty-seven are spoken each by about 1,000,000 people." But as a consequence of economic and political pressure, minor languages are disappearing rapidly.—The *New York Times* of Jan. 24 contained a long editorial from the Jan. 14 issue of *The Caribbean Press* of Colon, Panama, in which it was predicted that the time is not so far distant "when the Western Hemisphere will see a race for supremacy between the English and Spanish languages, with the chance about 10 to 1 that Spanish will win out." This prediction was based not only on the rapid increase in population of South America, but also on the ever-growing interest in Spanish in the United States. In order to bring about better relations between the United States and Latin America, Waldo Frank urged, at a dinner given in his honor in New York on Feb. 17, that "we must have closer bonds of cultural understanding." Other speakers were Otto H. Kahn, Professor F. de Onís, Lewis Mumford and Dr. S. P. Duggan, who presided. In this connection it may be noted that the first Argentine student to win a scholarship in the United States under the auspices of the Argentine-American Cultural Institute was L. Justo, son of a former Minister of War, who sailed for New York on April 3. Furthermore this same Institute established on April 10 a scholarship for an Argentine girl to study at Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.—Governor Theodore Roosevelt of Porto Rico seems to have met a vigorous enemy in the form of the Spanish language. Recently, for example, he announced to an audience that he was "the mother of four children," and on another occasion introduced a certain army officer not as a bachelor, but as "a tapeworm."—Since both Italy and Spain are now claiming Christopher Columbus, it is not surprising to learn that Corsica also wishes to be considered a contender for that honor. In a lecture delivered at Marseilles on February 17, Canon Castaing affirmed that the discoverer of America was the son of a wool carder of Calvi, Corsica, and lived there until he was 10 years of age, attending school at a convent, and later going to Pavia. It is obvious that the question can never be settled until Andorra and San Marino are heard from.—The Committee of the Beaux Arts Ministry of France voted on March 5 to install the statues of Marshals Foch and Maunoury in two of the twenty-two vacant niches in the façade of the Louvre on the Rue de Rivoli. Those now occupied are devoted almost solely to Napoleon's generals, which were set in place under Napoleon III when the Façade was reconstructed.—An appeal for support of the Academy for Jewish Research was issued on April 11 by L. Ginsberg and D. S. Blondheim, Professor of Romance Philology at Johns Hopkins University. An edition of the works of Moses Maimonides is to be issued in 1935, the 800th anniversary of his birth.—Now that we have futurism in literature and the arts, why not also in cooking?, asks Jules Maincave, chef of a Parisian hotel, who wishes to break with the traditions of French cuisine. Instead of oil and vinegar, he proposes oil and champagne, or rum and juice of roast pork. Other dishes advocated by him are filet of mutton with crayfish sauce, oyster omelette, sardines with camembert, purée of herring with strawberry jelly, tomato whipped cream, etc. Instead of using parsley, bay leaves, etc., for seasoning, he advises rose perfume, lily of the valley, lilac or verberna. Georges Beaume, who says he has tested these futuristic dishes, warmly commends them in *l'Opinion*. The *New York Times*, of March 2, cites as materspieces of "medical cooking," Maincave's recipe of a purée of carrots dressed with cod liver oil, intended, of course, for children, and roast beef served with snail syrup for persons susceptible to lung trouble.—Two of the four famous old circuses of Paris have disappeared of late, the Nouveau Cirque and the Cirque de Paris. However, the Cirque Medrano and the Cirque d'Hiver still survive.

J. L. G.

NEW PUBLICATIONS
of the
Institute of French Studies, Inc.
G. L. VAN ROOSBROECK, Editor

M. M. BARR—*A Bibliography of Writings on Voltaire (1825-1925)*

"This *Bibliography* must be regarded as one of the fundamental works of reference for all students of eighteenth-century French literature."—Professor George R. Havens in *Modern Language Notes*, May, 1930.

H. D. MAC PHERSON—*R. L. Stevenson. A Study in French Influence*

"Your Stevenson book is charmingly done and is extraordinarily accurate in all its facts."—Lloyd Osborne (Stepson of R. L. Stevenson).

BY THE SAME AUTHOR:

Censorship under Louis XIV (1661-1715). Some Aspects of Its Influence

I. LEAVENWORTH—*The Physics of Pascal*

J. HARRIS—*Marie de France: The Lays Gugemar, Lanval and a Fragment of Yonec. With a study of the life and work of the author*

A. E. TERRY—*Jeanne D'Arc in Periodical Literature (1894-1929)*

R. D. SCOTT—*The Thumb of Knowledge in Legends of Finn, Sigurd, and Taliesin. Studies in Celtic and French Literature*

H. L. COOK—*Georges de Scudéry, La Mort de César*, republished with an Introduction

Address orders to:

PROFESSOR G. L. VAN ROOSBROECK
PHILOSOPHY HALL
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK, N. Y., U. S. A.

